

AMERICAN JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY

VOL. XIX, 3.

WHOLE No. 75.

I.—CERTAIN DRAMATIC ELEMENTS IN SANSKRIT PLAYS, WITH PARALLELS IN THE ENGLISH DRAMA.

FIRST SERIES.¹

The drama of India offers a fruitful field of research to those who are interested in dramatic literature and in the development of histrionic art. The old Hindu dramaturgical writings and critical works yield many a bit of information that is useful for the history of the world's stage, and we find in the Sanskrit plays themselves many dramatic devices which are worthy of study or of consideration. As an introduction to further investigations in this field, a few of these dramatic elements will be examined in the light of literary criticism and of conventions of the stage. Four (4) points have been selected for attention: the *first* of these is the employment of a play within the play as a scheme for furthering the action of a piece; the *second* relates to a device that is used for bringing about a dramatic situation and startling effect—namely, the restoration of the dead to life upon the stage; the *third* discusses scenes of intoxication as a humorous device; the *fourth*, the employment of letters and missives as a means of complicating or of unravelling the action of a drama. These four points will be discussed in order, and parallels will be pointed out upon the English stage.

¹ The results of the present studies were presented in abstract at the meeting of the American Oriental Society, in April, 1897, and in April, 1898.

1. *Notes on the Use of a Play within a Play on the Sanskrit Stage.*

The introduction of a play within a play, or the employment of such dramatic interludes, is familiar to every student of the English stage since the days of Hamlet's 'Mousetrap.' The same dramatic device was known to the playwrights of India, and it is interesting to find that the import and character of these episodic performances were duly taken into consideration by Sanskrit dramatic critics of antiquity.

An episodic play is likened by De Quincey to a picture within a painted scene. Its purpose, dramatically, is to develop the action or to bring out character. On the English stage, for example, the play scene in Hamlet is a turning-point in the drama; and the action is similarly advanced by the inserted dramatic performance in Kyd's Spanish Tragedy and in Greene's James the Fourth. An example of the use of a play within play being employed chiefly to develop character is found in the Sir Thomas More (perhaps the earliest instance of such a dramatic interlude in English), or again in the Interlude of the Nine Worthies in Love's Labour's Lost. The double usage of this dramatic element seems to be united in just proportion and in even balance when we come to the tradesman's play of Pyramus and Thisby in Midsummer Night's Dream. So much by way of introduction.

From the histrionic standpoint, the occurrence of a play within a play implies a considerable previous dramatic development and history: this is not a dramatic device that naturally belongs to the infancy of the drama; it occurs usually in the more advanced stages of the art. The preliminary steps that gave rise to the play within play we can easily trace in England. Its growth is readily seen from the old Interlude, which was the last piece of scaffolding used in the pre-Elizabethan drama before we have the completed edifice of the actual great drama under Renaissance influences. In India, unfortunately, we cannot trace the evolution of the pre-Kālidāsan drama, nor do we have the play within play in Kālidāsa's dramatic works, and yet in his successors the episodic performance appears fully developed.

In the Sanskrit dramatic canons the name of a little play incorporated within an act is *garbhāṅka*, or embryo-play; this is defined in the Sāhitya-Darpaṇa, ch. 6, 279, ed. Roer and Ballantyne, I, p. 127; II, p. 176:

*añkōdarapraviṣṭō yō raṅgadvārāmukhādīmān
añkō 'paraḥ sa garbhāñkaḥ sabijaḥ phalavān api*

'a secondary act which is incorporated into the body of an act, and which has its own Prologue, Introduction, etc., and has a Scene of Opening Action (lit. 'seed') and a Dénouement (lit. 'fruit'), is known as a *Garbhāñka* (i. e. interlude, play within play).' The Sanskrit commentary to the passage cites the dramatic interlude of 'Sita's Svayamvara' in Rājas'ekhara's *Bāla-Rāmāyaṇa* as an illustration of the *Garbhāñka*: *yathā bālarā-māyaṇē . . . sītāsvayamvarō nāma garbhāñkaḥ* (op. cit. I, p. 127; II, p. 176, transl. of *Pramadā-Dāsa* Mitra). Three instances of the *Garbhāñka* will be examined here (cf. also PWB. and Apte, Skt. Dict.), and one or two other scenes in Sanskrit drama that are somewhat kindred to the *Garbhāñka* will be noticed in addition. These latter stand in about the same relation to the episodic play as the masque and dumb-show scenes in Shakspeare's *Cymbeline*, *Pericles*, and *Hamlet*. If space allowed it, attention might also be given to the nature of the *Viṣkambhaka*, which is inserted between the acts as an induction or prelude, and serves somewhat the same dramatic office as that discharged by the Chorus in Shakspeare's *Henry the Fifth* (*Sāhitya-Darpaṇa*, ch. 6, 308). The discussion, however, is limited to the single point under consideration, the *Garbhāñka*.

Neither in *S'ūdraka*, the reputed author of the *Mṛcchakaṭikā*, nor in *Kālidāsa*'s three dramas, have we an example of a play within play. The intermezzo of the dancing and song scene in the *Mālavikāgnimitra* (act ii) is not a point for consideration here. In the *Urvas'ī* we might perhaps conceive of the *Garbhāñka* having been introduced to advantage. In this drama *Kālidāsa* might possibly have arranged as a play within play the brief story of 'Lakṣmī's Choice,' the dramatic production in which the divine nymph *Urvas'ī* made the fatal blunder in speaking her line falsely. This he has chosen instead to give in narrative in the *Viṣkambhaka* (see also the definition of *viṣkambhaka* in *Sāh. D.*, ch. 6, 308).

The first real instance of the play within play is to be found in the *Priyadars'ikā* of *S'rī-Harsha-Deva* (A. D. 7th century). The extensive dramatic allusions in this piece and the elaborate preparations for this cleverly introduced scene on which the play turns, remind one remotely of the numerous dramatic references in the

Love's Labour's Lost, Hamlet, or Midsummer Night's Dream. The plot of the *Priyadars'ikā* is a story of love and court intrigue at the palace of King Vatsa of Udayana. On the evening of the *Kāumudī* festival, a play is to be presented for the entertainment of the queen. The circumstances of the scene are to represent, in a complimentary manner, how King Vatsa first won the love and the hand of his royal consort by giving her lessons upon the lyre. The queen's maid-in-waiting (the lost princess *Priyadars'ikā* in disguise) is to play the rôle of prima donna. One of the court maidens is to assume male disguise and to impersonate the king. But King Vatsa has actually fallen deeply in love with *Priyadars'ikā*, and by cunning intrigue it is arranged that he himself shall assume the rôle of instructor in music, and shall play the part of love-making to the fair *Priyadars'ikā* in the very presence of the queen. So real does the action seem that the queen heartily applauds, until the realism surpasses ordinary bounds and she discovers the ruse to which she has been a victim, interrupts the scene, and the performance is stopped somewhat as in the Hamlet episode. This interpolated play-scene occupies the entire third act of the four acts which make up this bright comedy, and it is an integral part of the drama; for, after it, the incognito heroine is discovered to be the long-lost princess whom Fate and her father had before betrothed to the king, and she is received as his youngest wife. The whole scene is one that is well managed, and the situation which is brought about by this *Garbhāṅka* is cleverly designed.

The next dramatist of India who makes use of the dramatic interlude is the renowned *Bhavabhūti*, in the eighth century of our era. In the last act (vii) of his well-known drama, the *Uttara-Rāma-Carita*, or Sequel to the Story of Rāma, there occurs a theatrical representation which is as much essential to the solution of the piece as is the kindred masque in the last act of Shakspeare's *Cymbeline*. The story is the familiar one; the play is a sort of Sanskrit *Winter's Tale*. Like Leontes in the *Winter's Tale*, Rāma has banished his faithful wife *Sītā*, and he has never seen the twin sons *Kus'a* and *Lava*, that were born in the forest wilds. Like *Guiderius* and *Aviragus*, reared by old *Belarius* in the *Cymbeline*, they have grown to be youths of heroic mould. In the sixth act of the play, Fate has restored these manly striplings to their father's arms. But the joy is not complete; *Sītā*, the patient *Griselda*, must be restored, and for

this touching scene Bhavabhūti has chosen the device of a miniature play or masque in which the circumstances of the birth and youth of the royal lads are re-enacted before the father. A sense of the lapse of time that has taken place in the play is produced as in the Cymbeline. The scene is worth describing in the next paragraph, as it conveys a good idea of the manner in which such a masque-production was conducted on the Sanskrit stage, and it brings out the point which was noted above, that of adding reality to a play by making its own actors spectators at a mimic play within itself. The principal details of the scene may be gathered from the following notes and parallels.

Rāma, filled with grief for the loss of his banished wife, comes to the banks of the Ganges, where a play of the revered sage Vālmiki is to be presented. One is reminded of Shakspeare's lines in the *Midsummer Night's Dream*: 'this green plot shall be our stage, this hawthorn-brake our tiring house.' The audience take their seats as in the Hamlet play. The stage-manager (*sūtradhāra*, Utt. Rām. Car. vii. 20), in strict dramatic fashion, speaks the prologue. The circumstances attending upon the birth of Rāma's sons in the forest are now enacted, even with such graphic detail as bringing, or pretending to bring, the infant babes upon the stage. The divine promise of their future greatness is made, and the purity of their mother, the chaste Sitā, is vindicated. So vivid does the scene become that Rāma is moved to tears and grief; but his cup is turned from bitterness and sorrow to overflowing sweetness and joy when the fictitious Sitā of the mimic play, like Hermione of the *Winter's Tale*, is found really to be his wife and she takes her place by his side as queen, instead of the golden statue which Rāma had set up (*hiraṇmayī sitāyāḥ pratikṛtiḥ*, acts ii, iii and vii).

The third example of the Garbhāṅka is the illustration given in the commentary to the *Sāhitya-Darpaṇa* passage cited above (ch. 6, 279). It is found in act iii of the long ten-act play *Bala-Rāmāyaṇa* of Rājas'ekhara, whose date is placed between the ninth and the tenth centuries of our era. For the text see *Bala-rāmāyaṇa*, ed. Govindadeva S'āstri, pp. 58-85. The story is the familiar one in the Rāma cycle, and it is excellently summarized in Lévi's *Théâtre Indien*, pp. 272-7, of which I have made use. The demon-king Rāvaṇa, as an unsuccessful suitor for the hand of the beautiful Sitā, has become the sworn enemy of her husband, Rāma. The play describes how he pines away with hope-

less love. A dramatic troupe visits his palace under the directorship of Kohala; arrangements are made to have a performance before the king (Bāla-Ram. III, p. 58, ed. G. S'āstri). By happy or unhappy chance, the subject of the miniature play is the betrothal of Sītā to Rāma (*sītāsvayaṃvara iti nāṭakam*). The Garbhāṅka, interlude or interpolated spectacle begins; and its action, as before noted, serves to make the actual drama itself more realistic. The very scene is enacted of Rāma's triumph over all rivals; the enraged Rāvaṇa can scarce suppress the fury of his heart, in spite of efforts made to pacify him and despite the assurance that it is a mere exhibition or spectacle (*prēkṣaṇa*). The players' scene is interrupted as in the Hamlet, and the Garbhāṅka comes to a close: *iti niṣkrāntāḥ sarvā, sītāsvayaṃvarō nāma garbhāṅkaḥ*, p. 85, ed. Govindadeva S'āstri. A similar interruption of a mimic play was recorded above in the Priyadars'ikā. While speaking of the Bāla-Rāmāyaṇa from the dramatic standpoint, mention might be made in passing of the idea of the use of the marionettes or puppet representation which is alluded to in the Viṣkambhaka to act v of this play and developed in the course of the act, but the likeness is more remote.

Three plays, accordingly, have here been examined as illustrating the use of an interpolated act or miniature play. These are Harsha-Deva's Priyadars'ikā, Bhavabhūti's Uttara-Rāma-Carita, and Rājas'ekhara's Bāla-Rāmāyaṇa. The list may be extended by further reading.

Finally, attention may be drawn in this connection to an element or dramatic incident that is akin to the dumb-show or Prospero's beautiful masque in the Tempest: it is the scene in Harsha-Deva's Ratnāvalī (act iv, p. 67, Nirṇaya Sāgara edition; cf. Wilson, Theatre of the Hindus, II, p. 306 seq.) in which the king and the queen sit and watch the magician Samvara-Siddhi waving his bunch of peacock feathers (*picchakaṃ bhramayan*) and conjuring up before the mind's eye marvels and wonders that surpass even the surprises which Prospero's wand called forth for Ferdinand and Miranda. It is true that this scene is merely a performance to the mind's eye and does not strictly come within the scope of a play within a play, but it requires mention because it resembles the masque element or dumb-show incident and causes the regular action of the drama to be suspended for the time being and also contributes to the dénouement. Another example comparable with this, but really one

that is more important as it forms the opening of the action of the play in which it occurs, is the magic scene in Rājas'ekhara's Karpūramañjarī (act i, pp. 25-30, Nirṇaya-Sāgara edition). In this the sorcerer Bhairavānanda, through his art as wizard, brings upon the stage the fair heroine, with whom the king falls in love. The scene reminds one in its character of the parallel situation in Marlowe's famous play in which Faustus beholds the vision of Helen of Troy (Doctor Faustus, ed. Ward, pp. 38-41). Both these illustrations, however, lie strictly outside the present subject, but there is at least an indirect kinship with the interpolated play.

In conclusion it may be said that enough has been brought forward to show that the device of a play within a play was employed with good effect in the Sanskrit drama. The employment of this element in the far-away dramas of India is not without interest, for it is a device that was unknown to the classic drama of Greece and Rome; nor does it seem to have been elaborated elsewhere until we find it fully developed and flourishing in our own drama at its rise during the great age of Queen Elizabeth. The *garbhāṅka* of early India is therefore the play within play of later Europe. Orient and Occident, after all, are not so remote from each other in art.

2. *Restoration of the Dead to Life, employed as a Dramatic Element.*

Students of dramatic literature are familiar with the Hindu rule of action which precludes death on the stage; they are equally familiar with the classic canon of India which enjoins that a happy ending shall be found for every play. In practice, however, occasions arise which require the death of the hero or heroine to be announced, and in one or two cases apparently the scene is enacted before the spectators' eyes. Yet the strict dramatic canon must not be violated and a happy issue must ultimately be found. This gives rise, in at least two instances, to the employment of a device which is effective, or even startling—namely, the restoration of the dead to life; in other words, a resuscitation or revivifying of one who is actually gone or is apparently dead. In the realm of Hindu fiction there are a number of stories told of a return from death to life, but in the drama, so far as I know, the representation of such an occurrence,

or the employment of it as a dramatic motive, is only exceptional. Two special instances are worth discussing, for they produce a striking situation in the action and a vivid effect.

The more sensational of the two illustrations to which I refer is found in a play that is remarkable for its Buddhistic coloring: I allude to *Srī-Harsha-Deva's Nāgānanda* (act v, pp. 86-91, *Nirṇaya Sāgara* edition; cf. Bergaigne, *La Joie des Serpents*, traduite, pp. 134-41). The self-sacrificing hero *Jimūtavāhana*—a noble example of vicarious suffering—gives his life to save one of the serpent race, and, to all appearance, he dies before the eyes of the spectators as a victim of the claws and ravening beak of the monstrous bird *Garuḍa*. But the play must end happily. After destroying its victim the insatiate winged monster feels remorse and repents: away it flies to *Indra* for a draught of ambrosia—*amṛtasamskirtana*—to restore the dead victim. The goddess *Gaurī* appears upon the scene; she sprinkles the divine liquid upon the lifeless body and exclaims *jīva jīmūtavāhana*; when suddenly, to the joy of all concerned, the hero rises up and is restored (*nāyaka uttiṣṭhati*, p. 89). A brief but vivid description then follows, portraying in narrative form the miraculous scene which succeeded. A rain of heavenly ambrosia descends upon the serpent mountain; the dry bones of the dead reptiles which the ravenous bird had previously destroyed are instantly clothed with life; in a moving mass, with raised crests and variegated hues, the serpents are described as winding their way in tortuous course down the mountain side, eagerly quaffing the divine nectar as they crawl along. The use of such a dramatic device is a bold stroke. The scene of reviving *Jimūtavāhana* is well conceived and carried out. The idea, moreover, of bringing back to life the parched bones of the serpents that had perished before the exalted hero rescued their race by his self-assumed sacrifice, is a worthy conception and shows resources of imagination. In treating both this scene and the following, however, it must be remembered that as a religious tenet the resurrection of the dead does not play any part in the faith of India as it did play in Persia. It may be added that the whole scene in the drama under discussion is almost identical with the narrative in *Kathā-sarit-sāgara*, ch. 22, which preserves in verse the entire story of *Jimūtavāhana* and his self-sacrifice (cf. *Kathā-sarit-sāgara*, transl. by Tawney, I, p. 184 seq.).

Superior in pathos, if not equal in sensational effect, is the

second instance to be criticised. This dramatic device is the one which the author likewise has reserved for the last act to add stir and interest to the dénouement. The allusion made is to that admirable drama, Kshemīs'vara's Caṇḍa-Kaus'ika (act v, p. 132, ed. Jivānanda Vidyāsāgara; cf. Fritze, Kausika's Zorn, übersetzt, p. 82). The curse of the wrathful son of Kus'ika has brought ruin upon the king and upon his house. His wife and child, sold, as they are, into servitude, and himself as a vile Caṇḍāla in the common cemetery, present a woeful pageant. The cup of misery is brimmed to overflowing in the fifth act of the drama, which represents the meeting of the wretched parents beside the lifeless body of their son, upon the common burning ground of the dead. Amid a scene of heartrending pathos, Dharma, the god of justice, descends, and at his word, given in commanding tone, *vatsa rōhilāśva samāśvasihi, samāvasihi!* the youth slowly opens his eyes and is restored living to the arms of his overjoyed parents, upon whom blessings are now showered to make up for their miseries past. The ideas are not wholly remote from Biblical parallels and, dramatically, the conception is good and is well worked out.

Different in character from the two preceding, but worthy of mention, are several instances that are found in Sanskrit plays of the restoration of those who have been supposed to be dead or who have been transformed into lifeless objects. Such instances, for example, may be quoted as Vasantasena in the Mṛcchakaṭikā (act x, p. 171, ed. Stenzler; cf. Wilson, Theatre of the Hindus, I, p. 171; Kellner, Vasantasena, p. 187), or again the return of the transformed Urvas'ī in the Vikramorvas'īya (act iv, p. 116, Nirṇaya Sāgara edition; cf. Wilson, Theatre, I, p. 256; Fritze, Urvasi, p. 66), or finally Sītā, restored from the forest, in Uttara-Rāma-Carita (act vii, p. 123 seq., Calcutta edition, 1831). One or two other like instances might be cited. They merit this passing mention, not because they are actual instances of a return to life, but because they have the same effect dramatically as the restoration of Hero in Shakspeare's Much Ado, or of Hermione in the Winter's Tale.

By way of supplement in this connection, notice may simply be taken, in a few words, of several allusions to an actual restoration of the dead to life which are found elsewhere in Sanskrit literature. One of the most characteristic of these *revenant* stories is the tale of the three young Brahmans and their dead lady-love,

as told in the Kathā-sarit-sāgara, ch. 76 (Tawney's transl., II, p. 242 = Vetāla 2, cf. Manning, Ancient India, II, p. 327). A second is the story of the lady who mixed up the heads of her decapitated husband and brother when she restored their bodies to life, Kathā., ch. 80 (Tawney's transl., II, p. 261 = Vetāla 6, cf. Manning, Ancient India, II, p. 328). The Kathā-sarit-sāgara affords others; for example, the hermit, ch. 97 (Tawney, II, p. 321 = Vetāla 23, cf. Manning, p. 332), and the story of Indradatta and King Nanda, Kathā 4 (Tawney, I, pp. 21-2, cf. Wilson, Theatre, II, p. 138). The Panchatantra tells of the four Brahmins who brought a dead lion back to life (Panch. v. 4). Other familiar tales of the kind are the narrative in the Rāmāyaṇa of the restoration of the monkeys who had fallen fighting in Rāma's behalf; again of Kāma, who had been reduced to ashes, as told in Kūmāra Sambhava; or the well-known Upanishad account of Naciketas; or the story of Kādambarī calling her lover back to life by her embrace (Weber, ZDMG. VII 588 = Indische Streifen, I 367, cf. transl. of Kādambarī by C. M. Ridding, pp. 206-7). Bāṇa himself in the Kādambarī gives a half dozen other instances of a reputed return from death to life (p. 138, transl. C. M. Ridding).

3. *Scene of Intoxication on the Stage as a Humorous Device.*

Every student of Elizabethan literature is familiar with the introduction of rollicking scenes of merry-making, including drinking bouts and the singing of hilarious catches, as a dramatic device on the English stage. The amusing scene of the bibulous Tom Tossplot and his boon companions in the Morality play 'Like Will to Like, quod the Devil to the Colier' is a good illustration of the crude use of a coarse device which culminates in a subtle refinement of art when Shakspeare puts into Cassio's mouth the great lines of self-rebuke after the tipsy episode in the Othello. Euripides as well as Aristophanes among the Greeks and Plautus in Latin comedy did not hesitate, of course, to present such scenes upon the stage. It is not without interest to find that in two or three instances the Hindu playwrights employed representations of intoxication as a dramatic means to an end, for making a humorous situation or for developing the plot of the play. The Sāhitya-Darpaṇa, ch. 3, 174, incidentally alludes to the effects of intoxication (*mada-*) arising from wine.

The special incident on the Sanskrit stage to which attention is here called is, first, a scene found in a drama already mentioned—namely, Śrī-Harsha-Deva's *Nāgānanda* (act iii, 1 seq., p. 37, ed. S. G. Bhanap; cf. Bergaigne, *Joie des Serpents*, p. 59). The wedding festivities of the hero are being celebrated in carnival style; the parasite Ś'ekharaka enters in a state of intoxication (*matta-*) and with his head crowned with flowers. He is attended by a servant who bears a jug of liquor upon his shoulder; and draughts are drawn from this jug in the course of the scene. The stage directions represent the parasite as reeling, staggering or tripping (*ghūrṇan, praskhalan*). Humor and fun, of the Ben Jonson order, are added when the muddled and tipsy fellow mistakes the comedy-making buffoon, or *Vidūṣaka*, for his sweet-heart in disguise. Numerous amusing complications thus arise, and they add an atmosphere of merriment to the occasion of the marriage festivities. The scene is quite bright and it is well designed. In a remote way it might remind one of Sir Andrew Aguecheek, Toby Belch and Maria.

The second instance is found in the remarkable Sanskrit morality play *Prabodha-Candrodaya*, or 'Rise of the Intellectual Moon.' Near the end of the third act, there occurs a scene of intoxication, participated in by the votaries of several heretical sects. This situation is employed by the author for the purpose of inculcating virtuous behavior and religious belief, much in the manner of the English morality plays with which the composition is often compared. An English version of the scene is accessible in the rendering by Taylor, *Prabodha-Chandrodaya*, Bombay, 1886 (earlier edition, 1811).

The third example is of less interest and importance, but it is worth mentioning in this connection because it is found in Kālidāsa's *Mālavikāgnimitra* (act iii, pp. 48-9, *Nirṇaya Sāgara* edition). The jilted queen Irāvati appears upon the scene in a tipsy condition, as both text and stage direction imply (see also note in Tawney's translation of the play, p. 38; although the note is omitted in the second edition, p. 44). The fair one's state is doubtless due to the quaffing of flower wine (cf. Tawney's note, and also C. M. Ridding, *Kādambarī*, transl., p. 109). Rising to the situation, or in apology for her mental exhilaration, she quotes a popular saying to the effect that a tipsy condition serves rather as an embellishment in a woman (*madō kila t̥hīājāṇassa maṇḍa-ṇam ti*)! Irāvati walks as best she can, but her progress is not

very happy, as she says herself that her feet refuse to carry her, *calaṇā uṇa ṇa maha paśaranti*. By way of criticism, however, it cannot be said that this scene really has any strong dramatic bearing upon the development of the play, even though it may serve to bring out certain traits in the character of the jealous Irāvati. See also Fritze, *Malavika und Agnimitra*, übersetzt, pp. 36-7; also G. R. Nandargikar, translation, p. 22; and Cimmino, *traduzione*, pp. 53-4.

4. *The Use of Letters and Epistolary Correspondence in Kālidāsa's Plays.*

The last dramatic device to which attention will be called in the present paper is the employment of letters, epistles, missives, or the like, as a means for furthering dramatic action in a play. We are familiar in English, for example, with Hamlet's love-letter to Ophelia, with Orlando's missives to Rosalind, and with the billets-doux of Benedick and Beatrice in which their hands are witnesses against their hearts; we recall Macbeth's written news to Lady Macbeth of Duncan's promised visit to the fatal castle, or, finally, among others we may remember the letters of state removing Othello from his office. The Sanskrit playwrights were perfectly familiar with similar devices for dramatic purposes, and I have made a collection of material on the subject from quite a number of Hindu dramas. By way of illustration I shall here briefly draw attention simply to the use of letters in Kālidāsa's plays, which is as ingenious as the usage of any author, but I shall not make any attempt at present to elaborate the theme. That is reserved for another occasion.

One naturally turns first to the *S'akuntalā*. In the third act of this play we have a dainty device by which *S'akuntalā* expresses her love for King Dushyanta by the lines of poesy which she writes with her nail upon the tender surface of a lotus leaf. Her valentine couplet reads (act iii, p. 55, ed. Pischel):

*tujjha ṇa āṇe hiaaṃ mama uṇa maṇḍo divā a rattim ca
nikkiva dābai baliyaṃ tuha huttamaṇḍorahāi aṅgāiṃ*

Ah, pitiless one! thy heart I cannot know;
Yet madly doth infatuation's fire

Consume my body with its flaming glow,
With love for thee, my very heart's desire.

Throughout the remainder of the act this incident of the inscribed love-leaf is prettily employed and the device is rather daintily brought in (act iii, p. 55 seq., ed. Pischel; cf. P. N. Patankar's edition, p. 116 seq.; also Monier Williams' translation, p. 74 seq.; and Edgren, pp. 68, 69, 77).

In a manner almost identical with this Kālidāsa again employs the device of a letter scratched upon a birch leaf in his drama *Vikramorvas'īya* (act ii, p. 45, Nirṇaya Sāgara edition; cf. Fritze, *Urvasī, übersetzt*, p. 27; Wilson, *Theatre of the Hindus*, I, p. 216). The situation in the play distinctly recalls the incident in the *S'akuntalā*. The fair nymph *Urvas'ī*, in a like verse scratched upon a leaf, declares her love for King *Purūravas*; the leaf is tossed before the king: his companion, the buffoon, amusingly mistakes it for the slough of a serpent. The funny complications, moreover, which arise when this billet-doux leaf accidentally falls later into the queen's hand, are cleverly and even humorously worked out in the course of the act.

Of a quite different character from these affectionate missives are the official letters which play so important a part in both the first and the last act of the *Mālavikāgnimitra*. These are formal epistles on matters of state addressed to the king, and they are either read to him by the minister (*Māl.* i, p. 10, Nirṇaya Sāgara edition; cf. Tawney's transl., 1st ed., p. 7), or the monarch himself reads them aloud (act v, pp. 102, 103; cf. Tawney, pp. 78-9); while early in act v allusion is made to a formal reading of a letter to the queen by the scribes (act v, p. 89, Nirṇaya Sāgara edition; cf. Tawney, p. 67). These letters, beside the part they play, have also the merit of giving us a general idea of epistolary correspondence.

In the same connection mention may furthermore be made of two allusions in *S'akuntalā* to a formal communication or to documents which incidentally play a minor rôle in this drama (*pattahatthe*, act vi, p. 238, ed. Patankar, different from Pischel, p. 116; cf. Edgren, p. 133, and *pattahattham*, act vi, p. 292, ed. Patankar, also ed. Pischel, p. 138; cf. Edgren, pp. 158-9), and also the letter which the king failed to write *S'akuntalā* as promised (act iv, p. 149, ed. Patankar, cf. Pischel, p. 77; cf. Edgren, p. 85).

The occurrences given above suffice briefly to illustrate a subject which it is hoped some time to examine more fully on a larger scale.

In conclusion I may say that the four dramatic devices to which attention has been called—namely, a play within a play, a reviving of the dead, intoxication, and the use of letters and epistles—are merely specimens of a hundred other devices employed in the Sanskrit plays and which link these compositions together with the dramatic writings of other nations and of other ages, especially with the romantic drama of England.

A. V. WILLIAMS JACKSON.

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY, NEW YORK CITY.

II.—AFFIRMATIVE FINAL CLAUSES IN THE LATIN HISTORIANS.

The object of the present paper is to give the number of occurrences and some of the most noticeable examples of the different forms used by the Latin historians to express design. The similarity in subject-matter calls for a similar vocabulary, the variations being due to the personality of the writer which has impressed itself upon his writings. Authors in other departments of literature differ widely from the historians in the use of these forms. This is due not so much to the personal characteristics of the writer as to the department which calls for a different form of expression. For writers such as Seneca, Quintilian and Tertullian the subjunctive with *ut* is by far the most common form. Legal writers, judging by the Institutes of Gaius and of Justinian, have a decided preference for *causa* with the gerund or gerundive.

A final clause expresses an action which is distinctly considered as an 'end' by the actors in the principal statement upon which the final clause depends. Without this distinct recognition of the action as limiting the principal action there cannot be a final clause. The principal clause is primarily one expressing an action performed that the conditions may be furnished for the limiting or final action. This final action is always future to the principal action and therefore contingent. It is considered as a possible action, for man does not seek to establish conditions for the performance of what seems impossible. As the final action is contingent, the clause itself indicates nothing as to the realization of the act. However, the interpretation of the clause depends, in many instances, upon the point from which it is viewed. Such a clause may be contingent to the principal actor, but to the reader may be a realized action. *Missi sunt legati qui dicerent* is the statement of an action contingent to the person by whom they were sent; but when the context shows that they made their statement, the reader may consider *qui dicerent* as a final clause, contingent from the standpoint of the principal actor, or as a consecutive clause expressing, from his point of view, a realized action. While the reader can, by changing the point of view,

change the final to a consecutive clause, the final clause readily passes into such a clause from the standpoint of the writer himself, so that an interpretation is necessary as to which point of view was taken by him. However, to give uniformity to the discussion, all the clauses will be considered from the standpoint of the principal actor.

With the furnishing of complete conditions or means for the realization of the 'end,' the mentally realized action becomes actualized, and then we have the consecutive clause. This is complete conformity of means to an end. But the question of conformity is free from ambiguity only when we take as the starting-point the conscious purpose of the human mind. In this case that which is conformable to an 'end' is the selection or combination of means which, by their action, bring about the conditions for the realization of the 'end.' The means are of themselves not conformable to an 'end,' but are of such sort that it is possible to use them for the accomplishment of the 'end.'

The adaptation or serviceableness of things to an 'end' is of frequent occurrence, but proves nothing as to a previous action of the will. For when once there exist things with recognized properties of their own, a statement of these properties may be expressed by constructions used in the case of a personal designer. When once the grammatical form of expressing conformity becomes fixed, it may be used in statements which express, not a conformation of means to an 'end,' but only the adaptation of things to a given result. This may be due to the fact that an original will element has faded out, and there is left a certain tendency or characteristic whose grammatical expression is the same as when the original personal element was present. This can be clearly seen in the constructions which follow certain adjectives in which adaptation, and not conformation, is expressed; e. g. Tac. Ann. 3, 60, 7 *nec ullum satis validum imperium erat coercendis seditionibus populi*; 15, 67, 13 *faciendis sceleribus promptus*. Hist. 1, 9, 13 *quod saluberrimum est ad continendam militarem fidem*; 2, 99, 8 *hebes ad sustinendum laborem miles*. In none of these is there the exercise of the will for the production of conditions for the attainment of a cognized 'end,' but merely the statement of the adaptation of an unwilling condition, or characteristic of something either personal or impersonal.

As can readily be seen from the examples given, the grammatical forms readily adapt themselves to the expression of

different ideas. In the development of the expression of finality, the increasing number of forms used is due to the gradual recognition of the adaptability, for the expression of finality, of certain grammatical forms which had not at first been so used. When expressed in finite verb-form, *ut* with the subjunctive was the form developed first. But as the early language-user freely employed the accusative either with or without *ad* to express the limit of motion, accusative forms of the verb were also used to express the action which was cognized as the 'end' of the principal action. In this way came about the use of the supine and of *ad* with the accusative of the gerund or gerundive. With certain verbs the latter retained their merely terminal character, and with nouns and adjectives continued to express adaptation to an action which was not conceived as an 'end.' As the sphere of the use of the dative widened, the dative of the gerund and gerundive came to be used, especially by Tacitus, in final clauses exactly as *ad* with the accusative. These had previously been used chiefly to indicate the adaptation of nouns, and the change to the expression of finality was but an extension of this use.

In acting conformably to an end, an agent or physical means may be employed, and regarded as sufficient for the accomplishment of the final action. It is the recognized sufficiency of the employed means, whether personal or impersonal, which accounts for the use of the relatives in final clauses. *Legati venerant qui dicerent* = (*legati qui dicerent*) *venerant*, the sufficiency of the *legati* for the task being implied in the preceding action. When the relative is in an oblique case, a dative, an ablative, or an accusative with *per*, there is a transfer from a relative clause modifying a noun to a verbal expression which is considered as the sufficient means for the attainment of the end. Sallust, Ep. Mith. 4 *praebeo exemplum quo rectius tua conponas*, *quo* is an ablative of means, with *exemplum* as antecedent. On the other hand, Sall. Jug. 52, 6 *aciem, quam . . . arte statuerat, quo hostium itineri officeret*, the action itself expressed by the clause *quam . . . statuerat* must be considered as the antecedent of *quo*. In clauses with both *qui* and *quo*, as has already been shown, the interpretation depends upon the point from which they are viewed, since they may be future and contingent to the principal actor, but past and realized to the reader. They may also be taken, as in the examples just given, as relative clauses showing the adaptation of an antecedent expressed by a noun or verbal expression, or as

final clauses in which the relative expresses the sufficient means for the accomplishment of the final action.

With the growth of reflection the limiting character of a future supplementary action was more clearly recognized, and with this recognition it came to be regarded as the 'end' of the preceding action. This, however, was not original with the Romans, but indicates the clearer recognition of the fitness for the Latin of a construction already used by the Greeks. While the recognition of the adaptability of the future participle to express finality is considered as a mark of Greek influence, it is to be noted that Roman writers for a long time kept aloof from it, and it is freely used only after the classical period. When the future participle is used with verbs of motion the participle is naturally taken as expressing the 'end' rather than as the mere continuation of the principal action. In *venit pugnaturus* the action expressed by the participle seems to have been distinctly cognized as the 'end' in the act of coming. The same would appear to be the case with *abscessit occisurus*, though here, as shown by the context, the killing was accidental and was not cognized as an 'end' in the departure. However, after verbs of motion the final idea generally prevails, and it may be used as coordinate with other forms expressing finality when dependent on the same verbs.

When *causa* is used with the genitive of the gerund or gerundive, the cause is the motive for the principal action, and therefore the 'end' in view.

The origin of all these is the same—the recognition of some future action as the end or limitation of the principal action. This 'end' gave rise to the motive which influenced the principal actor. Looked at in this way, the final clause expresses the end, the sufficient means, or the cause furnishing the sufficient reason for the motive influencing the actor.

In its genesis the final clause started from an original paratactic expression, out of which was developed a form of expression connected with the principal statement by a particle of uncertain origin, and used to express not only finality, but other relations as well. Looked at from the negative side, the negative particle is *ne*. Nothing, however, can be learned from this, since the negative in consecutive clauses is *non*, a compound differing from *ne* only by combination with another word. This exclusive use of *ne* with the subjunctive as the negative form seems to point to the original exclusive use of the subjunctive to express finality.

Still, in the forms not expressed by *ne* the use of the negative is precluded, for the denial of the existence of the end, the means or the cause destroys it as a motive for the principal action, for it would be the denial of the existence of that for which the preceding action took place. (For instances of *ut ne* and *quo ne*, see Draeger, II 688, 542.)

I.—PRIMARY FORM.

Ut.

The clauses with *ut* are divided into two classes: those which express a purely contingent action, and complementary clauses—those in which an original imperative is subordinated to certain classes of verbs, especially of willing and desiring. The latter class differs from the former, since the imperative expresses not a contingent action, but one which is conceived as actually carried into effect. When these become subordinate they retain their imperative force, indicating necessary (*should*) rather than contingent action (*may* or *might*). In this expression of the obligation resting upon the subject of the subordinate clause they resemble the consecutive clauses, and at the same time are connected with the final clauses in that they express the motive (enforced) of the principal clause. The number of verbs after which *ut* is used is very large, and some of the verbs which usually have a final clause dependent on them may sometimes take a complementary clause of the second class. *Mitto* and *scribo* will illustrate this. Caes. B. G. 5, 11, 4 Labieno scribit ut . . . naves instituat. Livy 32, 38, 2 scribit ut tyrannum ipse conveniret. *Mitto* and its compounds with *nuntius* and *litterae* often have the force of a command; e. g. Caes. B. C. 1, 9, 3 litteras ad senatum miserit, ut . . . discederent; 3, 80, 3 nuntios mittit, ut . . . veniant. Livy 29, 36, 6; 30, 25, 5; 39, 11, 6.

In a few instances there is an ellipsis of the verb, e. g. Livy 2, 12, 13 'en tibi' inquit, 'ut sentias, quam vile corpus sit'; Florus 1, 10, 6 en, ut scias quem virum effugeris.

Instances in which there is a final clause dependent on a final clause are not uncommon, and need no special comment. Two final clauses dependent on the same verb are fairly common, in many instances one being affirmative while the other is negative. Livy 24, 8, 14 trium rerum causa paravimus ut . . . popularetur, ut . . . essent, ante omnia ne . . . transportaretur; 25, 15, 20; 30, 4, 11 mittit, simul ut . . . converteret, simul ne qua . . . eruptio . . .

fieret. Tac. Agr. 26, 11; Ann. 3, 65, 3; 4, 6, 19; 13, 39, 6. Just. 2, 15, 13; 14, 1, 2 indicavit, ne . . . extolleret, aut . . . terreret, simul ut . . . cognosceret. Examples are by no means uncommon in which a negated affirmative final clause is contrasted with a following clause: Livy 3, 48, 2 descendisse, non ut quemquam quietum violaret, sed ut turbantes . . . coereret; 10, 8, 4; 25, 31, 5; 26, 41, 6 agamus, non ut ipsi maneamus in Hispania, sed ne Poeni maneant, nec ut . . . arceamus, sed ut ultro transeamus. Vell. 2, 53, 4 non ut arguerem, sed ne arguerer. Curt. 8, 8, 10 veni enim in Asiam, non ut funditus everterem gentes, nec ut solitudinem facerem, sed ut illos . . . non paeniteret. Just. 31, 5, 1; 39, 3, 5. Tac. Germ. 28, 21 ut arcerent, non ut custodirentur; Ann. (1, 12, 10;) 1, 13, 20; 13, 19, 9 non ut Africanum sibi seponeret, sed ne opibus . . . potiretur. (Amm. Marc. 26, 7, 16?) Val. Max. 9, 1 P. non quidem ut ullum honorem recipiat, sed ut . . . possit; 3, 7, Ext. 1 ut eum doceret, non ut ab eo disceret.

Different forms of expressing finality are sometimes used in the two parts: Sall. Cat. 33, 1 arma cepisse neque quo periculum aliis faceremus, sed uti corpora nostra ab iniuria tuta forent. Tac. H. 4, 5, 6 non, ut plerique, ut . . . velaret, sed quo . . . capesseret. Livy 45, 22, 14 haec non gloriandi causa rettuli, . . . sed ut admonerem. Just. P. 5 quod ad te ** non tam cognoscendi quam emendendi causa transmissi, simul ut et otii mei . . . apud te ratio constaret. Amm. Marc. 21, 13, 3 properare coegit, non ut lacerarent Persas in proelia, sed praetenturis iuncturos . . . ripas. Tac. H. 1, 83, 9 neque ut adfectus vestros in amorem mei accenderem, neque ut animum ad virtutem cohortarer . . . sed veni postulaturus. In other passages in which there is a change of construction, the negative is not used: Sall. Or. Lep. 23. Livy 30, 16, 15 alios ad Scipionem, ut indutias facerent, alios Romam ad pacem petendam mittunt. (Just. 1, 9, 12.) Livy 1, 11, 7; 23, 26, 7 ad populandum dimisit *et* ut palantis exciperent; 44, 18, 2. Sall. Cat. 58, 3. Just. 8, 3, 8 mittit qui opinionem sererent . . . , et ut . . . sollicitarent. Tac. Ann. 13, 24, 2 quo maior species libertatis esset, utque miles . . . incorruptior ageret. Just. 25, 3, 7 speculaturus eventus . . . se recepit, ut bellum reparetur. Amm. Marc. 28, 6, 7 creavere legatos . . . primitias oblaturus, utque . . . ruinas docerent intrepide.

The formula *non modo . . . sed etiam* is sometimes used to intensify the statement of the design: Livy 34, 7, 3 nec ut vivi solum habeant, sed etiam ut cum eo crementur mortui. Tac.

Ann. 11, 24, 9 *ut non modo singuli viritim, sed terrae, gentes in nomen nostrum coalescerent.* Just. 16, 5, 11 *filium quoque suum Ceraunon vocat, ut deos non mendacio tantum, verum etiam nominibus inludat.*

In some instances the final clause is preceded by a negative, though the clause itself is still affirmative: Livy 42, 24, 9 *concessisse, non ut eriperent.* This, however, is not so common as the statements in which the negative follows *ut*, and negatives, not the clause, but a particular word in the clause: Caes. B. C. 2, 5, 5 *ut ne ad conandum quidem . . . viderent.* Livy 42, 45, 7 *ut non expectatam adhortationem esse appareret, ostenderunt.* Cf. 37, 13, 7. Curt. 7, 5, 40. Amm. Marc. 14, 11, 26 *subdidit rotam, ut universitatem regere . . . non ignoretur.* In some other passages *ut* is followed by two negatives referring to individual words: Livy 35, 25, 8 *adnisurum ut . . . nec pacis eos paeniteret, nec belli.* Curt. 4, 13, 34. Val. Max. 5, 2, 10. Just. 43, 1, 2; Amm. Marc. 24, 4, 22; 25, 3, 1. Nepos Dat. 6, 2 *ut neque circumire posset, neque impediri.* Livy 22, 12, 8 *ut neque omitteret eum, neque congredederetur;* Just. 9, 4, 3 *temperavit ut neque apud suos exultasse, neque apud victos insultasse videretur.* Clauses containing *ut* followed by *neque . . . et* are not numerous: Sall. Jug. 85, 6. Livy 1, 28, 5 *ut nec . . . averteretur . . . animus, et . . . iniceretur;* 1, 43, 10 *ut neque—et;* 1, 44, 4 *consecrabant, ut neque . . . continuarentur, . . . et extrinsecus . . . pateret;* 10, 20, 7 *consedit ut nec adventus suus . . . nosci posset, et egredientem castris hostem opprimeret.*

Successive final clauses are not infrequent, some correlative in many instances being used with *ut*: Livy 1, 43, 2 *seniores . . . ut praesto essent, iuvenes ut foris bella gererent;* 26, 39, 10; 34, 46, 11; 37, 13, 7; 38, 26, 2; 35, 26, 2 *ut experiretur, simul ut omnia . . . essent.* Bell. Af. 85, 2 *sive ut . . . sive ut.* Bell. Al. 36, 5 *observari: ut, sive amicus Domitius eas angustias transiret . . . sive inimicus ut . . . veniret.* Livy 36, 16, 10 *subsistendum . . . ut, sive victus ab consule rex esset, in expedito haberent . . . sive vinceret, ut . . . Romanos persequerentur;* 44, 8, 1 *ducit, simul ut praesidium eius firmaret, simul ut militi frumentum . . . divideret;* 44, 46, 2 *misit . . . simul ut Sinticen evastaret et ad omnes conatus regis impedimento esset;* 37, 41, 7 *eminebant falces . . . illa ut . . . abscideret, haec ut . . . contingeret.* Just. 13, 4, 9 *dividit, simul ut aemulos removeret, et munus . . . faceret.* Florus 1, 1, 12 *illi, ut et fidem solverent et ulciscerentur, clipeis obruere.* Tac. Ann. 16, 23, 9 *delectum . . . ut . . . obscuraretur, an ut . . . ostentaret.*

The following are the occurrences noticed for each of the writers examined:

Sallust,	26	Curtius,	106	Amm. Marc.,	197
Caesar,	109	Justinus,	78	Dares,	28
Nepos,	34	Tacitus,	188	Dict. Cret.,	8
Livy,	830	Suetonius,	67	Aur. Victor,	23
Velleius,	7	Florus,	32	Eutropius,	21
Val. Max.,	139	Hist. Aug.,	151		

II.—SECONDARY FORMS.

A. *Accusatives*.—a. *Supines*.

The supine in *-um* is a verbal noun of the fourth declension, chiefly used as a limiting accusative after verbs of motion. The most important apparent exceptions are *pessum*, *venum*, *nuptum* with *dare*, the latter also with *collocare*. There is, however, in these verbs a distinct idea of transference, and for that reason the accusative is used. Sall. Or. Macri 17 neque ego vos ultum iniurias hortor, seems to be an exception to the rule, but it is possible that *ire* has fallen from the text. If we have the statement as it was written by Sallust it must be considered as an older, freer use of the supine, or else as an indication of an effort on the part of Sallust to use the supine not as a terminal accusative, but as the object of verbs not expressing motion. The latter is probably the reason, for he seems to have adopted or extended the use of two other forms expressing finality.

The use of the supine has been discussed by Richter, *De Supinis Latinae Linguae* (5 programs), Königsberg, 1856-60; and by Draeger, H. S., II 858-66. Frequently found in early Latin, it gradually fell into disuse and was not freely used by any except archaistic writers. Of the ones examined, Sallust, Nepos, and Dictys Cretensis use it relatively most frequently. Livy has by far the largest number of occurrences, but the number per page, Teubner text, is not so large as in some of the others. Florus has but one example, *petitum*, I, 44 (3, 10), which is also used Origo Gentis Rom. (Aurelius Victor?) 20, 1, both writers evidently taking it from Livy I, 11, 6. In the case of other writers, some of the supines are due to the sources from which were derived the facts stated. Owing to this, the number of supines used by any writer is not a safe criterion of the frequency of the use of the supine in the vocabulary of the day. This is true of

all writers whose statements are derived from earlier sources. In Valerius Maximus, *questum* 4, 1, 7 occurs in the same story Livy 26, 29, 4; *petitum* 9, 6, 1: Livy 1, 11, 6; *deprecatum* 4, 7, 1: Cic. Lael. 11, 37; *sessum* 4, 5 Ext. 2: Cic. Cato Maior 18, 63. *Supplicatum* 3, 7, 1e is given in what purports to be the exact words of Scipio, 'Quirites . . . aecum est vos mecum ire in Capitolium supplicatum.' Livy 38, 51, 10 has a slightly different statement, 'Quirites, ite mecum, et orate deos.' In the De Viris Illustribus (Aurelius Victor?) 49, 16 is still another form, 'quasi bonum factum, in Capitolium eamus, et diis supplicemus.' The difference between these statements indicates either that the remarks had been handed down in different forms, or that each writer fixed them up to suit himself. Owing to the loss of the early historical sources, it is impossible to tell to what extent the supines were copied by later writers. In Sallust and Livy about one-third of the supines are in speeches or in indirect discourse. In Livy they are about equally divided between these two; in Sallust, nearly all are in the orations.

Of the writers examined, only three—Caesar, Sallust and Tacitus—have assigned to them works written at different periods. But the writing of Livy extended over such a long period of time that, in his case as well as in that of Caesar, Sallust and Tacitus, comparisons of the style at different periods can be made. In the Catiline there are three, one (c. 52, 12) in the speech assigned to Caesar. In the Jugurtha there are twenty-one, three (24, 2; 31, 27; 85, 42) in speeches, and one (109, 2) in indirect discourse. Four of the six in the fragments of the Hist. are in orations, a fact of no special significance, as the orations make up the larger part of the fragments. There is also one, *oppugnatum*, in the Invective against Cicero (2, 3) assigned by the MSS to Sallust. This increased use of the supine by Sallust is due to the archaistic tendency shown in his later works; there is also an increased number in the later works of Tacitus, due very likely to the increasing influence of Sallust. Caesar has sixteen occurrences, three of them (*pabulatum*) being in the Bell. Civ. The eighth book Bell. Gall. has three (?), while in the other works once assigned to Caesar there are ten: *Oratum* (Bell. Al. 34, 1; 67, 1) occurs three times in Caesar; *frumentatum* Bell. Af. 9, 1; 11, 3; 67, 2: B. G. 4, 32, 1; 6, 36, 2; 8, 10, 1; *aquatum* Bell. Af. 7, 5: B. G. 8, 41, 1 (?). The remainder—*deprecatum* (Bell. Hisp. 35, 1), *dormitum* (Bell. Af. 88, 3), *efflagitatum* (Bell. Af. 22, 5), and *praedatum* (Bell. Al. 10, 2)—do not occur in Caesar at all.

There are one hundred and fifty-six passages in Livy containing supines. The number for the different decades (62, 46, 34, 14) indicates a decrease in its use, due probably to the fact that in the earlier decades he followed early Roman sources more closely than he did afterwards. This is also indicated by the fact that the first decade contains fifteen out of the twenty-four supines found in indirect discourse. There are twenty used in speeches, *comisatum* occurring five times in book 40 (7, 5; 9, 11; 10, 4; 13, 2; 14, 5) in the account of the trouble between Perseus and Demetrius. Book 28, 39-41 has four supines; 7, 30-31, three. The distribution of the supines of different verbs depends on certain historical considerations at different periods. Nine out of eleven examples of the use of *exulatum* occur in the first decade. *Comisatum* occurs only in book 40. *Gratulatum* occurs ten times, six in book 45, which contains an account of the embassy of the Rhodians to the Romans.

Richter, Part II, p. 5 seqq., discusses at length the occurrences of the verbs of which other forms than the supines are used to express finality. In this respect authors differ widely. Livy has *frumentatum* nine times, *pabulatum* twelve, *lignatum* six, but does not use the gerund forms; Caesar has both. Livy has *praedatum* thirty times, the gerund forms six; Caesar only the gerund forms. Owing to the small number of supines used by most of the writers examined, comparisons with other forms employed by them are needless. As the supine was an early form, it is not used except with verbs current in the early language, and for that reason, when finality was to be expressed by verbs developed later, it was necessary to take some other form.

The following table gives the number for the different authors of passages containing supines:

Sallust,	29	Curtius,	3?	Amm. Marc.,	14
Caesar,	16	Justinus,	8	Dares Phryg.,	3
Nepos,	20	Tacitus,	12	Dict. Cret.,	33
Livy,	156	Suetonius,	4	Aur. Victor,	5
Velleius,	0	Florus,	1	Eutropius,	0
Val. Max.,	10	Hist. Aug.,	4	(Hyg. Fab.,	23)

Owing to variations in textual readings it is not possible to give the exact number for each author. A few of these variations will be given, the accepted reading being placed first. Sall. Jug. 102, 12 ob regnum tutandum: tutatum; Bell. Gall. 8, 41, 1 aequatorum:

aquatum; Livy 22, 38, 3 ubi ad decuriatum aut centuriatum con-
venissent: ad decuriandum aut centuriandum: decuriatum aut
centuriatum. 42, 25, 8 legati venirent speculaturi: speculari:
speculatum. 8, 26, 1 depopulaturum: depopulatum. 2, 48, 4
dipopulandum: depopulatum. 2, 34, 3 ad frumentum coemen-
dum, non in Etruria modo, . . . sed [quaesitum] in Sicilia quoque.
Quaesitum is bracketed by Weissenborn because of the change of
construction with the formula *non modo . . . sed etiam*. The
position of *quaesitum* may be compared with that of *postremo*
32, 40, 11 non aurum modo iis, sed postremo vestem quoque.
Cf. 38, 37, 4 non gratulatum modo venerant, sed coronas etiam
. . . attulerant. A few instances of the coordination of the supine
and gerund are found elsewhere: 29, 28, 10 speculatum ad mare
turbandos egredientis ex navibus missi. 34, 62, 5 ad purganda
crimina et questum de se Romam eos ituros comperit. Tac. Agr.
28, 8 mox ad aquandum atque utilia raptum. This is the reading
of Halm and Draeger, though the latter does not give this
instance of *raptum* in the H. S., II, p. 863, nor in the Syntax u.
Stil, §217. A similar coordination also takes place with other
grammatical forms. Livy 1, 54, 2 praedatum atque in expedi-
tiones. 22, 14, 4 spectatum . . . ut ad rem fruendam. The supine
is also sometimes used with another form expressing design in the
same sentence: Sall. Or. Lep. 23 nisi forte tribuniciam potestatem
evorsum profecti sunt . . . utique iura et iudicia sibimet extor-
querent. Nepos Milt. 1, 2 ex his delecti Delphos deliberatum
missi sunt, qui consulerent Apollinem. Curt. 4, 10, 11 equites
praemisit speculatum, simul ut ignem . . . extinguerent. For an
interchange of construction with another form in successive
clauses, see Livy 31, 42, 4 aquatum ire iubet . . . aquandi causa
missis. Dictys Cretensis 5, 6 non civitatem vestram consideratum
Argis venimus, verum adversum vos dimicaturi. Frequently two
supines (e. g. Livy 2, 37, 4; 3, 25, 6; 25, 34, 4), rarely three are
dependent on the same verb, e. g. Livy 25, 39, 8 pabulatum, lig-
natumque et praedatum quidam dilapsi fuerant.

It will not be without interest to compare the usage of writers
whose stylistic features are similar in other respects. Sallust was
followed by Tacitus, and he in turn by Ammianus Marcellinus.
Sallust has the supines of twenty-four verbs, occurring in all
twenty-nine times, including Or. Macri 16 auctum atque adiutum
properatis. Tacitus has twelve occurrences of six different
supines, *raptum* (3), *illusum* and *oppugnatum* once each, not

occurring in Sallust. Tacitus has *ultum* five times; Sallust, twice. *Perditum* in Tac. once; in Sall. three times; *oratum* once in each. As the frequency of the supine in Tacitus is much less than in Sallust there is not room for extended comparisons. Amm. Marc. has *ereptum* (19, 3, 3; 22, 2, 2; 23, 6, 40; 29, 1, 18), *opitulatum* (16, 12, 45; 28, 5, 2) and eight others occurring singly, including 17, 8, 5 *mittere precatum consultumque*. Five of these are found also in Sallust, but none of them in Tacitus. Curtius has but three, including 9, 1, 2 (*repletum: repleturum*), and in this respect differs widely from Livy, who uses the supine freely. This indicates that in the use of the supine at least, Curtius did not break away from the usual vocabulary of his day, in which the supine was not freely used.

b. *Ad with Accusative of Gerund and Gerundive.*

Ad with the accusative of the ger. is one of the most common forms, owing to the large number of verbs of motion which are used. In some instances in the case of successive clauses there is a change in form of expression and two forms are used in the same sentence: Livy 6, 28, 8 *potius ad delendam memoriam dedecoris, quam ut timorem faciat*; 23, 24, 1 *ad consules subrogandos veniret . . . ut noscere possent*; 23, 26, 7; 44, 33, 8 *non . . . ire ut armis utatur, sed ad vigilandum, ut . . . recipiat se excitetque ad arma alios*; 45, 10, 2 *ad susceptam legationem peragendam navigare Aegyptum pergit, ut . . . posset*. Suet. Jul. 4 *secedere statuit, et ad declinandam invidiam et ut . . . operam daret*. Amm. Marc. 14, 1, 6 *ad colligendos rumores . . . relaturi*; 20, 8, 19 *ad id munus implendum electi viri . . . relaturi . . . acturi*.

The formula *non modo . . . sed etiam* is sometimes used to strengthen successive clauses in which the ger. is used: Livy 21, 32, 4 *non ad tuendos tantummodo . . . sed etiam ad pellendum*; 25, 15, 18 *non ad frumenta modo . . . corrumpenda, sed ad Capuam oppugnandam*; 28, 40, 1. *Ad* with the ger. is also quite commonly used in adversative clauses introduced by *non . . . sed*. Livy 26, 8, 5 *non ad Romam obsidendam, sed ad Capuae liberandam obsidionem ire*; 35, 38, 9 *non ad oppugnandos, sed ad liberandos*. Cf. 33, 31, 9 *ad liberandam Graeciam, non ad transferendum . . . imperium*. A noun is also used as correlative with the gerund: Livy 5, 17, 1 *ad prodigii Albani procuracionem ac deos rite placandos*; 45, 3, 8 *non ad ullam aliam rem quam ad*

Perseum eripiendum. Curt. 4, 9, 13 non ad quietem sed ad praeparandos animos diebus datis. The number of occurrences noticed is as follows:

Caesar, 63	Val. Max., 117	Hist. Aug., 68
Sallust, 16	Justinus, 96	Aur. Vict., 35
Nepos, 27	Tacitus, 83	Eutropius, 13
Livy, 937	Suetonius, 91	Dares, 7
Velleius, 17	Florus, 9	Dict. Cret., 28
Curtius, 89	Amm. Marc., 141	

1. *Dative of Ger.*—In early Latin the dative of the gerund and gerundive was not freely used. See Draeger, H. S., II 598. Schwenke, Ueber das Gerundium u. Gerundivum bei Caesar und Cornelius Nepos, p. 22, gives but three examples: Caes. B. G. 3, 4, 1; 5, 27, 5; 5, 34, 2, and the latter should be a genitive. The use of the dative was extended by Livy, who uses it after a large number of adjectives and nouns, and also in place of a final clause. See Draeger, H. S., II, p. 843, where eight examples are cited. Most of them, however, are dependent on nouns showing their adaptability, or in the case of an assembly or of an officer the service to be rendered or duty to be performed, e. g. 25, 5, 2 comitia inde pontifici maximo creando sunt habita. 10, 8, 3 duoviris sacris faciundis. 10, 28, 13 luendis periculis piacula simus. Such groups made up of nouns with gerunds or gerundives were used as the objects of verbs, and in course of time the nouns came to be regarded as forming a group, not with the gerund forms, but with the verbs, and then the gerund forms were considered as expressing the end of the action, rather than the adaptation of the nouns. But as the earliest use was as modifier of the noun, it is not always possible to tell which idea was predominant in the mind of the writer, and whether the gerund form is to be considered as dependent on the noun or on the verb. Curt. 4, 2, 18 materies ratibus faciendis advehebatur; 7, 6, 13 condendae urbi sedem . . . elegerat. In both of these examples the gerundive may be taken as showing the adaptation of the noun, or the end of the action expressed by the verb together with its object, or its subject in the case of a verb in the passive voice. The same is true of many others, e. g. Suet. Titus 8 medendae valitudini leniendisq. morbis . . . opem adhibuit; Nero 49 ligna conferri curando mox cadaveri. It is possible that in the course of development the same statement may have been

viewed in different ways. A gerundive which to Livy expressed the adaptation of the noun, to Tacitus might seem to express the end of the combined verbal and nominal elements. However, for the sake of uniformity, the different examples will be considered from the latter standpoint. Livy 2, 56, 2 eum vexandis . . . consulibus permissurum tribunatum; 24, 34, 7 machinamenta qua-tiendis muris portabant; 24, 40, 15 quae oppugnandae urbi com-parata erant; 26, 16, 8; 27, 15, 5; 29, 20, 2 recuperandae His-paniae delegerit ducem; 30, 12, 18; 36, 35, 4; 39, 22, 6 locum oppido condendo ceperunt. In Curtius the dat. of the gerundive is used in a few passages in which it may be taken as expressing either adaptation or finality. *Sedes* is used 7, 3, 23; 7, 6, 13; 7, 10, 15, as is *locus* in the passages last quoted from Livy. *Materies* is used the same way 4, 2, 19; 5, 3, 7; 8, 10, 30. Justinus has but one example, 2, 3, 16, XV annis pacandae Asiae inmorati.

Tacitus uses the construction more frequently than any other writer. Joerling, Ueber den Gebrauch des Gerundiums und Gerundivums bei Tacitus, pp. 11-12, gives fifty-three examples of the use of the dative in final clauses; nine similar instances are given p. 13. Helm, Quaestiones Syntacticae de Particip. Usu Tac., Vell., Sall., in discussing the dative, pp. 58-67, gives sixty-seven in which the ger. depends upon a verb. Joerling, p. 12, gives Hist. 3, 20, 14 num secures dolabrasque et cetera expug-nandis urbibus attulissent as a final dative. Draeger, Syntax u. Stil, 206B. a, classifies in the same way. Heraeus, *ad loc.*, and Helm, p. 66, consider *expugnandis* as explanatory of *cetera*. Ann. 15, 4, 1 ea dum a Corbulone tuendae Syriae parantur, and 6, 37, 5 ille equum placando amni adornasset, are put by Joerling in dif-ferent classes, in 6, 37 connecting the ger. with the verb. Helm also puts them in different classes, but makes the ger. in 6, 37 depend on the noun *equum*. Draeger, *ad loc.*, says, "Adornare mit dem Dativ nach Analogie von parare 15, 4." Ann. 4, 73, 6 proxima aestuaria aggeribus et pontibus traducendo graviori agmini firmat, is given by Helm and Draeger as a pure final clause. Joerling puts it into a sub-class.

The difference in classification is due to different criteria for determining finality. If direct dependence on a verb decides finality, then the list (31) given by Helm (p. 61 C.) gives the number of final datives of the ger. in Tacitus. Ann. 3, 19, 9 Drusus urbe egressus repetendis auspiciis, is certainly final. 6, 50, 20 recreandae defectioni cibum adferrent is equally so if

we consider *cibum* as forming a unit, not with the gerundive, but with the verb, and with the latter forming the conditions necessary for the fulfilment of the action expressed by the gerundive, which is considered as an end in the previous action. Looked at from this point of view the statement is but a particularized form of *recreandae defectioni agere*. Cf. 6, 43, 10 *reddendae dominationi venisse*. Interpreting the different datives of the gerund and gerundive in this way there are 75 in Tacitus which express finality. In Ammianus Marcellinus they are not of frequent occurrence. 19, 6, 1 *tempore ad quietem reficiendis corporibus dato*; 27, 10, 12; 21, 8, 1 *militibus regendis adposuit*. Aur. Victor, de Caes. 1, 6 *legatos mitterent orando foederi*. See Draeger, H. S., II, p. 845.

2. *Genitive of Gerund*.—The earliest instance of the use of the genitive of the gerund or gerundive to express finality is Terence, Adelph., 269 *vereor coram in os te laudare amplius, ne id adsentandi magis quam quo habeam gratum facere existumes*. Some change the genitive to the dative *adsentando*, but the genitive can be explained by assuming the omission of *causa*, a direct imitation of the Greek. Sallust has four similar examples: Fr. 1, 49, 8 (Kr.) *ut, omnia retinendae dominationis honesta aestumet*; Or. Phil. 3 *exercitum opprimundae libertatis habet*; 6 *arma opprimundae libertatis cepisset*; 10 *quae . . . cepit . . . legum ac libertatis subvortundae*. Constans, De Sermone Sallustiano, p. 130, admits the final force of the last example, and rejects the explanation based on the omission of *causa*. Appendix, p. 271, he calls them all genitives of quality or descriptive, and denies that there can be a final genitive of the gerund or gerundive, following Jordan (Krit. Beitr., p. 285), who thinks that these constructions arose from the old use of the gerund in which the genitive occurs joined to an attributive. That the construction was considered as an unusual one by Sallust is shown by the fact that instances of it do not occur excepting in his latest works. That they were considered as final is shown by a comparison with some other clauses similar in meaning occurring in the earlier works. Or. Phil. 10 = Cat. 33, 1 *arma . . . cepisse neque quo periculum aliis facerem, sed uti corpora nostra ab iniuria tuta forent*.

The development of the construction so far as it went was similar to that of the dative of the ger. in final clauses. At first it

was chiefly used as a modifier of a noun, and then was transferred to the expression of finality after the noun combined with a verb. The gen. of the ger. modifying a noun is not uncommon (Draeger, H. S., II 824), though there are but few examples of its use as a final clause. In a few instances the gen. may be explained as dependent on the noun, but it is better to take it as a final genitive: *Caes. B. G. 4, 17, 10 si naves deiciendi operis essent a barbaris missae. Livy, 8, 6, 11 placuit averruncandae deum irae victimas caedi. 9, 45, 18 ut mitterent Romam oratores pacis petendae amicitiaeque; 36, 27, 2. 9, 9, 19 capita luendae sponsonis feramus. Draeger, H. S., II, p. 842, 'luendae sponsoni (volgo: sponsonis, was keinen Sinn giebt).'*

Tacitus has nine examples in his larger works: *H. (2, 100, 13 proditiōis or proditiōi); 4, 25, 12; 42, 5. Ann. 2, 59, 2; (3, 7, 2); 3, 9, 5; 27, 2; 41, 9; 6, 30, 3; 12, 24, 5; 13, 11, 8 orationibus, quas Seneca testificando, quam honesta praeciperet, vel iactandi ingenii voce principis vulgabat. Later writers seem to have avoided using the construction. Amm. Marc. 25, 5, 7 clavos regendae navis commiserunt. Aur. Victor, de Caes. 15, 4 neque ipsum ostentandi sui bellum fecisse; de Vir. Illustr. 2, 6 Tarpeiam virginem nacti, quae aquae, causa sacrorum, hauriendae descenderat. Here the omission of causa with the ger. is due to its use with sacrorum. See Draeger, H. S., II, p. 834.*

B. Relative.—a. *Qui*.

The use of the relative pronoun = *ut* with a demonstrative is common to all writers, but of most frequent occurrence in those who give accounts of the transaction of business through others chiefly by sending representatives, or using a sufficient agent or means for the performance of a given act. In the classification of relative clauses there is a difference of opinion as to the place to be assigned to some of them. This can be seen by comparing the classification in the *Lex. Caes. of Menge and Preus*, p. 1109, and that in *Heynacher's Sprachgebrauch Caesars in Bell. Gall.*, p. 69. Excluding *mitto* and *praemitto*, the *Lex.* gives eighteen instances; Heynacher twenty-six. Two of the latter (6, 21, 1; 6, 39, 2) are classified as consecutive by the *Lex.*, while six others are given under other divisions. As in the classification of the genitive and the dative of the gerund and gerundive, different criteria seem to be used in determining the finality of the clauses. Many relative clauses may be considered as final if we take the

principal verb and the antecedent of the relative as together forming the conditions for the final action, e. g. *Nepos, Dion 4, 1 navem ei trirerem dedit, qua Corinthum deveheretur.*

The gender of the relative, though it is usually masculine, in no way affects the finality of the clause, for the means used for the attainment of the 'end' may be of any gender. *Livy 30, 25, 4 naves mitterent, quae se prosequerentur; Caes. B. C. 2, 18, 1 frumenti magnum numerum coegit, quod Massiliensibus . . . mitteret; Tac. Ann. 2, 25, 7 missa extemplo manus, quae hostem a fronte eliceret,* in no way differ from the statements in which the relative is masculine excepting that the principal actor has used impersonal means for the accomplishment of the end in view. The relative is usually in the nominative case, though there are numerous exceptions, the principal actor using the antecedent of the relative through which he might accomplish the end. This form of statement may make the subject of the principal and subordinate verbs the same, and, by denying efficient agency to the antecedent, more clearly indicate his subordination to the principal actor. *Per* with the accusative is sometimes used: *Livy 44, 31, 9 oratores . . . mitteret . . . per quos inducias peteret. Just. 24, 1, 2. Tacitus uses it most freely of all: Agr. 14, 9 castellis promotis, per quae fama aucti officii quaereretur; H. 4, 40, 7 tum sorte ducti, per quos redderentur bello rapta; Ann. 3, 8, 2; 3, 74, 18; 16, 2, 2; 16, 24, 6 scripsisse per quae claritudinem principis extolleret. Suet. Vesp. 10 sorte elegit per quos rapta bello restituerentur. Cf. Tac. H. 4, 40, 7 supra. The dative and the ablative are used in a few instances, chiefly in Tacitus, where these cases are required by the general form of the statement, e. g. Tac. Ann. 4, 44, 7 ipse delectus, cui minor Antonia, . . . in matrimonium daretur; 6, 3, 7 discordiam . . . quaesitam, qua rudes animos . . . propelleret. 12, 22, 14 mittitur tribunus, a quo ad mortem adigeretur. Bell. Gall. 8, 7, 1 dimittit . . . ad aliquos excipiendos, ex quibus hostium consilia cognosceret. Tac. Ann. 12, 56, 10. Curt. 8, 10, 2 navigia facere, quis in ulteriora transportari posset exercitus.*

A few passages will be given in which there is a double construction dependent on the same verb: *Livy 28, 5, 16 ut posset occurrere . . . mittit qui loca alta eligerent, unde editi ignes apparerent; Curt. 7, 6, 17 ad pertinaciam mitigandam . . . equites praemisit qui clementiam . . . ostenderent. Two final *qui* clauses dependent on the same verb are found. Curt. 4, 15, 6 mittit, qui*

et periculum ostenderet et, . . . consuleret. Curt. 6, 11, 7 *qui* is used in contrasted clauses, missuros ad oraculum, non *qui* Iovem interrogent, . . . sed *qui* gratias agant, *qui* vota . . . persolvant.

The following is the number of instances noticed in each writer:

Sallust,	10	Curtius,	49	Amm. Marc.,	9
Caesar,	57	Justinus,	35	Dares,	6
Nepos,	21	Tacitus,	98	Dict. Cret.,	3
Livy,	251	Suetonius,	25	Aur. Victor,	11
Velleius,	2	Florus,	2	Eutropius,	3
Val. Max.,	7	Hist. Aug.,	14		

b. *Quo*.

Quo is used referring either to a noun or an antecedent made up of verbal and nominal elements. In this the two parts coalesce as one, and to it the *quo* refers. It generally occurs with a comparative, the usage of Sallust and Tacitus being the most noticeable departure from the general rule. However, clauses in which there is a comparative do not always take *quo*, there being numerous instances in which other forms are used. Nor are all clauses final in which the comparative with *quo* is used. *Quominus* has become established as the introductory particle of a negative statement, which, from the character of the verbs with which it is used, may be considered as a negative consecutive clause, the action being regarded, not as contingent, but as actually prevented. However, the comparative *minus* is sometimes used with *quo* in final clauses, e. g. Curt. 5, 1, 40 ceterum *quo* minus damnum sentiret . . . renovabatur. Tac. H. 2, 89, 2 senatum et populum ante se agens, *quo* minus ut captam urbem ingrederetur. 4, 66, 4 *quo* minus ultra pergeret . . . restitit. In Sallust the comparative is not used in Cat. 11, 5; 14, 3; 38, 3; Jug. 52, 6; Hist. 1, 45, 1. Cat. 48, 4 properaret ad urbem adcedere, *quo* et ceterorum animos reficeret et illi facilius e periculo eriperentur. In this statement there is a comparative in one clause but not in the other, both dependent on the same verb. In one passage the verb has a comparative meaning. Jug. 37, 4 simulandi gratia, *quo* regi formidinem adderet. Caesar has one example, B. G. 2, 27, 2 pugnarunt, *quo* se legionariis militibus praeferrent. Bell. Af. 54, 3 constituunt, *quo* ceteri dissimiliter se gerant.

In Tacitus the comparative is omitted in nearly half the instances (38 : 43). Most of the examples, however, are in the Annals, there being two in the Agricola (18, 14; 38, 16), four in

the latter part of the Histories (3, 61, 10; 4, 14, 17; 4, 86, 11; 5, 4, 1), eight in the first part of the Annals and twenty-four in the second. This large increase for the second part of the Annals does not indicate a supplanting of *quo* without a comparative, for it occurs two-thirds as frequently in the second part as in the first (10 : 15). There was a steady growth in the construction, the number of occurrences in the Histories being one to eleven Teubner pages, in the first part of the Annals one to eight and one-half pages, in the second part one to six, the increase going chiefly to *quo* without the comparative. Suetonius has a few examples (Tib. 22). Ammianus does not use the form at all freely and generally without the comparative (19, 3, 1; 21, 3, 4; 21, 8, 3; 21, 10, 5).

That the construction both with and without the comparative was considered as equivalent to other forms can be shown by several passages in which different forms are used in successive clauses: Sall. Cat. 33, 1 *nos arma neque contra patriam cepisse neque quo periculum aliis faceremus, sed uti . . . forent*; 58, 3 *sed ego vos, quo pauca monerem, advocavi, simul uti causam mei consilii aperirem*. Nepos, Pelop. 2, 1 *Athenas se contulerunt, non quo sequerentur otium, sed ut . . . recuperare niterentur*. Florus 1, 34 [2, 19, 5] *quo melius appareant, simul et ne scelera virtutibus obstrepant*. Just. 9, 2, 10 *praemissis legatis, quo securiores faceret, qui nuntient Atheae*. Tac. H. 4, 5, 7 *ingenium . . . altioribus studiis . . . dedit, non, ut plerique, ut . . . otium velaret, sed quo firmior adversus fortuita rem p. capesseret*. Ann. 13, 9, 4 *quo bellum ex commodo pararet, an ut aemulationis suspectos . . . amoveret*. 13, 24, 1 *statio . . . demovetur, quo maior species libertatis esset, utque miles . . . incorruptior ageret*. 12, 40, 4 *aucta . . . fama quo venientem ducem exterrerent, atque illo augente audita, ut maior laus . . . tribueretur*. A good illustration of the repetition of *quo* clauses is Val. Max. 5, 1, Ext. 3 *quo tutius venirent, Lyconem Molosson obviam misit, quo honoratius exciperentur, ipse ornatu regio salutatum extra portam occurrit*.

A feature of some interest is the use of *quoque* at the beginning of a clause where *et quo* would be expected. This is not common. Draeger, H. S., II, p. 36, 2d quotes seven instances in various kinds of clauses, but only one of them final, Suet. Aug. 18 *quoque celebratior esset*. To this may be added the following: Nepos, Pelop. 4, 3; Livy 22, 3, 5; 22, 42, 2; Val. Max. 4, 7, 4; 5, 1, 11; 7, 6, Ext. 3; 9, 2, Ext. 5; 11. Curt. 8, 2, 12; Suet. Aug. 37; Cal. 16.

The number of occurrences noticed is as follows :

Sallust,	24	Curtius,	23	Amm. Marc.,	5
Caesar,	32	Justinus,	6	Dares,	0
Nepos,	18	Tacitus,	81	Dict. Cret.,	7
Livy,	78	Suetonius,	49	Aur. Victor,	2
Velleius,	4	Florus,	3	Eutropius,	2
Val. Max.,	55	Hist. Aug.,	10		

C. Future Forms.—a. Gerundive.

The gerundive is used to express finality after certain verbs of transferring. See Draeger, H. S., II, p. 822. It is used most frequently after *curo*, but the examples of this have not been included in the summary, as it expresses an action considered by the principal actor as definitely completed, and not as contingent. It stands in the same relation to the gerundive after other verbs as the subjunctive with *quominus* stands to final clauses.

Not counting occurrences with *curo* (21), it is used by Caesar with *do* (5) and *trado* (2). Bk. VIII B. G. has *do* (1) and *suscipio* (2). In Nepos these verbs occur as follows: *do* Lys. 4, 3; *trado* Milt. 3, 2; Them. 2, 8; Dat. 4, 5; 5, 6; Eum. 2, 1; 13, 4; *suscipio* Ep. 4, 1, (*curo* 6). See Lupus, Sprachgebrauch des Cornelius Nepos, p. 187. Sallust has *do* Jug. 6, 1; *attribuo* Jug. 90, 2; *praebeo* H. 3, 61, 6. The use of the gerundive was extended by Livy, it occurring with *do* (20), *loco* (16), *trado* (9), *relinquo* (6), *divido* and *obicio* 4 each, *suscipio* (3), *attribuo* (2), and ten other verbs once each. (See partial list of Draeger, II, p. 822.) Velleius has but three occurrences, *loco* 1, 13; *relinquo* 1, 16; *suscipio* 2, 124. Curtius has five with *do* and *praebeo* (1), and *trado* (3).

Valerius Maximus and Justinus are especially free in the use of the construction. Of forty-eight instances noticed in the former, *trado* occurs 21 times, *praebeo* 7, *relinquo* 4, *do* and *obicio* 3, *loco* 2, and eight others once each. In Justinus the proportion of the verbs used is about the same. Out of eighteen instances *trado* occurs 9, *do* and *praebeo* 2, and five others once each. Tacitus has the gerundive with eight verbs, seventeen times in all. This, however, includes seven instances with *habere* which are not final. This use of the gerundive is relatively far more frequent in the Dialogus than in the works of Tacitus. See Theilmann, *Habere* mit dem Infinitive, Archiv, II 69. Later writers seem to have used the gerundive expressing finality with increasing freedom. Suetonius has seventeen verbs with twenty-

seven occurrences of the gerundive. Amm. Marc. has eighteen with the gerundive, fourteen once each; *trado* 3, *committo*, *do*, and *mitto* 5 each. The Script. Hist. Aug. have thirty-one occurrences with sixteen verbs, *do* occurring 11 times, *accipio* 4. Florus has nine instances, Dict. Cret. eight, Aur. Vict. (?) twelve with six verbs, Eutropius three. (In the Institutes of Gaius and Justinian either *accipio* or *do* is used in twenty-four out of thirty occurrences.)

b. *Future Participle.*

The use of the future participle is the result of considering a continuative action as the end or limitation of the principal action. This is especially true after verbs of motion, as has been shown, but even then the participle is not always final. Quintilian 9, 3, 12 criticises Sallust for his use of the future participle, unde eousque processum est ut . . . visuros (pro) ad videndum missos idem auctor dixerit. Donatus ad Terence Hec. 5, 1, 33 also quotes from Sallust, graviore bello qui prohibitori venerant socii, frigere. Macrobius 1, 16, 33 quotes from an earlier writer, Cassius, Servium Tullium fecisse nundinas dicit, ut in urbem ex agris convenirent urbanas rusticasque res ordinaturi. If the entire statement is an exact quotation it indicates an early use of the future participle to express finality, but the participle is very likely due to Macrobius himself. In the Bell. Af. there is one instance of this use of the participle, 25, 4 dum alios adiuturus proficisceretur. The use of the participle was extended by Livy, and continued by later writers who employed the future more and more as the use of the supine declined. The development for a time seems to have been tentative, as is indicated by the occurrence with the participle of several particles indicating that the participles gave merely the ostensible motive for the principal action. The particles so used are *quasi*, *tamquam*, *ut* and *velut*. The following are the occurrences for each, in statements of apparent design:

Quasi. This particle is found most commonly in late writers, most frequently in Suetonius. Curt. 10, 5, 15. Just. 27, 3, 1; 22, 2, 10; 29, 2, 8 pacem fecit, non quasi alio bellum translaturus, sed ut Graeciae quieti consulturus. Tac. Ann. 2, 63, 15; 15, 10, 9 duxit legiones quasi proelio certaturus. 15, 72, 4. Suet. Jul. Caes. 82 (twice), Tib. 39; 70; 73; Cal. (34); 46; Nero (40); 47; Galba 9; 10; Otho 7; Vit. 15; 17. Amm. Marc. 26, 4, 1; 7, 5; 29, 2, 14; (31, 12, 9). Eutrop. 7, 2, 1.

Tamquam. Livy 21, 61, 1 tamquam occursurus . . . iter ad

mare convertit; 37, 23, 6; 40, 4, 10; 44, 9, 10; Val. Max. 9, 6, 2; 9, 12, Ext. 10 restitit tamquam . . . sustenturus. Dial. de Orat. 2, 15 contemnebat tamquam . . . habiturus. Tac. (H. 4, 19, 15); Ann. 6, 36, 4; 12, 49, 5; 14, 33, 17.

Ut. Livy 7, 23, 6 ut . . . initura, explicuisset aciem; 21, 32, 10 subiit tumulos ut . . . factururus. 28, 26, 12; 31, 42, 5; 35, 50, 11; (42, 63, 5). Val. Max. 5, 9, 2. Tac. Ann. 1, 47, 11; H. 2, 58, 10; 2, 80, 4; 3, 68, 17. Amm. Marc. 26, 8, 14; 29, 6, 5.

Velut. Livy 30, 4, 10; 44, 35, 14; 44, 35, 23 degressus . . . veluti . . . temptaturus. Val. Max. 4, 6, Ext. 3; 7, 3, 3; 8, 11, 7. Curt. 9, 7, 19. Just. 5, 10, 9; 22, 2, 10; 33, 2, 2. Tac. Ann. 4, 69, 8 velut recens cognita narraturus, . . . trahit.

The number of occurrences in final clauses is as follows:

Livy,	31	Tac.,	14	Dares,	1
Velleius,	4	Suet.,	10	Dict. Cret.,	2
Val. Max.,	10	Florus,	2	Aur. Victor,	1
Curt.,	52	Hist. Aug.,	31	Eutropius,	1
Just.,	30	Amm. Marc.,	150		

In Livy the number is least for the first decade (6, 10, 8, 7), which may perhaps be due to the fact that in the later decades he was influenced by the Greek authors consulted in writing of the war with Hannibal and the war in Greece. Val. Max. has but few examples, some of which may be due to the sources followed, although in a few instances, a comparison with Livy shows a stronger tendency to use the participle. Livy 1, 54, 5 ex suis unum sciscitatum Romam ad patrem mittit quidnam se facere vellet: Val. Max. 7, 4, 2 familiarem misit . . . quaesitum quidnam fieri vellet. Livy 1, 45, 6 bovem Romam actam deducit ad fanum Dianae et ante aram statuit: Val. Max. 7, 3, 1 bovem . . . actam in Aventino ante aram Dianae constituit . . . daturus. Livy 27, 40, 9 M. Livium ad bellum proficiscentem monenti Q. Fabio: Val. Max. 9, 3, 1 cum adversus Hasdrubalem Livius Salinator bellum gesturus urbe egrederetur, monente Fabio Maximo. The construction is found frequently in Curtius, Justinus and Amm. Marc., in whose work it is one of the most common forms expressing finality.

The verbs with which the future participle is used are chiefly verbs of motion, so that it covers about the same field as the supine, though the use is a little more extended. Sall. Or. Macri 16 auctum atque adiutum properatis, is the only passage in which *propero* is used with the supine, though Amm. Marc. has it with

the participle 15, 5, 7; 25, 8, 9; 26, 8, 3. *Adiutum* is also used by Nepos, and in a quotation by Gellius 14, 6, 1; Amm. Marc. has *iuvaturus* 14, 6, 17; 20, 4, 8. As an indication of the shifting from the supine to the future participle will be given a list of early supines which occur as participles in Ammianus, the figures after the colon being the references to that writer. Of course there was no definite time at which the change from the supine to participle was consciously made, but the comparison will show something of the general drift. *cognitum* Sall.: 23, 2, 2; 27, 5, 1. *nunciatum* Sall., Livy: 16, 12, 19; 25, 8, 7. *oratum* Caes., Sall., Livy: 21, 15, 4; 28, 1, 24; 29, 5, 15; 31, 12, 12. *hiematum*: 16, 3, 3; 20, 10, 3; 20, 11, 32. *petitum*, common in early writers: 14, 10, 9; 19, 8, 9; 22, 16, 11; 24, 4, 8; 27, 8, 2. *precatum* Livy: 17, 8, 5; 18, 2, 15. *spectatum* Livy, Val. Max.: 20, 2, 2; 31, 3, 5. *visum* Sall.: 28, 4, 18; 29, 3, 9. *venatum* Nepos, Livy, Suet.: 28, 4, 18. Some also appear as participles in Justinus. *speculatum* common earlier: 18, 2, 4; 25, 3, 7. *consultum* Nepos, Livy: 3, 3, 11; 11, 11, 2. *sciscitatum* common in accounts of religious embassies: 14, 6, 6. Some other participles also appear in Tacitus and Suet., and in some of the works both supine and participle forms of the same verb are found.

The participle did not take the place of the supine only, for in some instances it seems to have displaced *causa* or *gratia* with the genitive of the gerund or gerundive. *hiemandi* g. Sall. J. 61, 2; Caes. B. C. 1, 37, 1; Tac. Hist. 4, 3, 5; Amm. Marc. participle three times. *occidendi* gr. Val. Max. 9, 4, 2; Curt. 9, 7, 6. *indicandorum* c. Val. Max. 3, 3, Ext. 3; Curt. 6, 11, 19 *indicaturus*. Sall. J. 61, 4 *conloquendi* gr.: Val. Max. 4, 6, Ext. 3 *allocuturus*.

In a few instances there is a double construction dependent on the same verb, which shows that the construction was considered as the equivalent of the other forms. Livy 35, 29, 10 *progredi, ut intercluderent iter . . . simul etiam temptaturos*. Tac. Ann. 14, 8, 18 *si ad visendum venisset, . . . sin facinus patraturus*. 14, 41, 4 *reos, ne apud praefectum urbis arguerentur, ad praetorem detulisset, . . . ultionem elusurus*. Amm. Marc. 16, 11, 13 *Iulianus non levaturus incommoda Galliarum electus est, sed ut possit per bella deleri*; 17, 13, 5 *venere fluminis ripam, ut exitus docuit, non iussa facturi, sed ne viderentur militis praesentiam formidasse*; Dict. Cret. 1, 11 *contestandi magis gratia quam aliquid ex oratione profecturus cuncta . . . retexuit*. With these may also be placed Just. 1, 10, 14 *recepit, . . . regnum firmaturus, ut . . .*

videretur. 9, 1, 9 praedandi causa profectus est, . . . inpenas belli refecturus. The full equivalence may also be shown by some separate passages from Livy: 41, 22, 5 oraculum aditurus Delphos descendit; 41, 23, 14 ut . . . conspiceretur, Delphos descendit; 42, 15, 4 satis constabat Eumenem, ut sacrificaret Apollini, Delphos escensurum; 42, 42, 2 sacrificandi causa . . . Delphos escendi.

In a few instances there are two participles dependent on the same verb, e. g. Just. 7, 3, 5 evocat, cultius exornaturus gratioresque reducturus. Amm. Marc. 20, 8, 19 electi . . . relaturi . . . acturi; 28, 4, 18 visuri processerunt aut . . . venaturi.

D. *Causal*.—*Causa* or *Gratia* with Genitive of Ger.

Causa is much more frequently used with the genitive of the ger. than is *gratia*, though the latter is the predominant form used by a few writers.

The following is the number noticed for the different authors examined:

	Causa.	Gratia.		Causa.	Gratia.
Sallust,	4	9	Suetonius,	15	7
Caesar,	85	2	Hist. Aug.,	8	5
Nepos,	1	5	Amm. Marc.,	14	8
Livy,	112	3	Florus,	0	0
Velleius,	2	3	Aur. Victor,	0	9
Val. Max.,	8	26	Eutropius,	1	0
Curtius,	0	0	Dict. Cret.,	3	3
Justinus,	3	2	Gaius (Inst.)	18	10
Tacitus,	5	2	Just. "	18	13

In Sallust, two of the occurrences of *causa* are in the Catiline, while all the examples of *gratia* are in the Jugurtha. This indicates an increasing fondness for the word on the part of Sallust. Of the other writers, Nepos, Valerius Maximus, Aurelius Victor, and the legal writers are the only ones in which the use of *gratia* is noticeable. In Caesar, *gratia* is used B. C. 2, 7, 3 nuntii perferendi gratia; B. G. 7, 43, 2 legatos ad Caesarem, sui purgandi gratia mittunt. Haec faciunt recipiendorum suorum causa. Here the use of *gratia* is evidently due to *causa* in the following clause. Livy has three examples, 6, 31, 2; 7, 3, 9; 22, 59, 7, the last being in a speech. A slight indication of individual preference may be seen by comparing the accounts given by Livy and by Val. Max. of the unfortunate professor of the Falisci. Livy 5, 27, 2

has lusus exercendique causa producere . . . ad Camillum perduxit. Val. Max. 6, 5, 1 pueros velut ambulandi gratia eductos in castra Romanorum perduxit.

Both words may be used with either verbal or nominal elements, so that we may have, after each, an expression calling attention either to the attainment of an object, or to the object obtained, e. g. *frumentandi causa* B. C. 1, 48, 7; B. G. 4, 9, 3; 4, 12, 1; 4, 16, 2: *rei frumentariae causa* in six passages; *frumenti c.* in two. Livy 9, 34, 12 quem clavi fingendi aut ludorum causa dictatorem audacter crees. As a still better example of change in form of expression may be given Suet. Jul. Caes. 30 (Cic. de Off. 3, 21, 82):

Nam si violandum ius, regnandi gratia,
Violandum est: aliis rebus pietatem colas.

This is a translation of Euripides, Phoen. 534-535:

εἴπερ γὰρ ἀδικεῖν χρή, τυραννίδος πέρι
κάλλιστον ἀδικεῖν, τὰλλα δ' εὖσεβεῖν χρεών,

regnandi gratia taking the place of a noun dependent on a preposition.

Instead of the ablative, *per causam* may be used without any apparent difference of meaning. Caes. B. C. 3, 24, 1 per causam exercendorum remigum ad fauces portus prodire iussit. 3, 76, 1 equitatum per causam pabulandi emissum. B. G. 7, 9, 1 per causam supplementi equitatusque cogendi ab exercitu discedit. Bell. Af. 73, 3 per causam frumentandi. Livy 22, 61, 8. Suet. Caes. 2.

A few examples will be quoted in which *causa* or *gratia* is used in successive contrasted clauses. Livy 36, 9, 4 non belli faciendi sed tuendae et stabiliendae libertatis Thessalorum causa. Amm. Marc. 28, 1, 4 non consolandi gratia, sed probrose monendi. Slightly different from these are the passages in which the formula *non modo* is used. Livy 4, 21, 6 non modo praedandi causa, . . . sed . . . populabundi descenderent. 28, 38, 8 non suffragandi modo, sed etiam spectandi causa P. Scipionis.

In some passages the construction with *causa* is coordinate with another form, e. g. Livy 1, 11, 7 necavere, seu ut vi capta potius arx videretur, seu prodendi exempli causa. 45, 22, 14 haec non gloriandi causa rettuli . . . sed ut admonerem. Amm. Marc. 22, 8, 47 constat . . . pariendi gratia, petere pisces, ut salubrius fetus educant.

The construction is active throughout, excepting Just. 17, 3, 11 Athenas quoque erudiendi gratia missus. Here the gerund with *gratia*, as in the quotation from Euripides already given, may be a translation of a Greek noun and preposition not indicating voice at all. Cf. Archiv, I 169 seqq. for a discussion of the use of *causa* and *gratia*.

III.—DIFFERENT WORKS COMPARED.

The indications of personality in the use of the different forms used to express design make the investigation of some importance as a test of the question of authorship. While they are not absolutely conclusive as to authorship, still they are of value in a complete statement of stylistic similarities and divergences obtained by a comparison of different works. The most noticeable features in the works of Sallust occur in his latest productions, as is also the case with Tacitus. In the Oratio and Epistula ad Caes. Senem, and the Inv. in Tullium, *ut* is by far the most common form used, though the supine occurs Inv. 2, 3 domum tuam oppugnatum venerat. However, the pieces are so short and the subject-matter so different from that in the works of Sallust that there is not a sufficient basis for extended comparisons. It is different in the case of the works which have been assigned to Caesar. Each of these has a considerable number of examples, and at a few points there are indications of decided preferences in the choice of forms. The following table gives the number of occurrences for the different works:

A. Caesar.

	Caes.	Bk. VIII. B. G.	Bell. Al.	Bell. Af.	Bell. Hisp.
ad,	63	22	29	14	21
ut,	109	7	16	25	9
qui,	57	10	3	3	2
quo,	32	6	4	9	1
causa,	85	4	8	1	0
gratia,	2	1		12	
supine,	16	2	3	6	1
gerundive,	7	2	3	3	1
fut. part.,				1	

The Bell. Af. is characterized by a more extended use of *ut* than of *ad*, the use of *gratia* instead of *causa*, of the fut. part. and of the supine more commonly than the other works. The absence of both *causa* and *gratia* from the Bell. Hisp. is noticeable. The Bell. Al. and Book VIII B. G. do not materially differ,

and are very much like the genuine works of Caesar except in the proportion of *ad* and *ut*.

B. *Script. Hist. Aug.*

In the works of the six *Scriptores Hist. Aug.*, 298 occurrences were noticed. The subject-matter is about the same in all, though the number per page, Teubner text, varies from .71 in Spartian to .44 in Treb. Poll. and Vopiscus. The following table gives the number of occurrences for each of the writers:

	Capitol.	Spartian.	Lamprid.	Vopiscus.	Treb. Poll.	Vulc. Gall.	
ut,	46	20	39	23	16	7	151
ad,	15	25	14	8	6		68
qui,	1	8	2	2	1		14
quo,	5	2	1	2			10
causa,	2	1	2	1	2		8
gratia,	2	2			1		5
supine,	1		2	1			4
fut. part.,	1		1	2	3		7
gerundive,	14	8	1	4	4		31
	<hr/> 87	<hr/> 66	<hr/> 62	<hr/> 43	<hr/> 33	<hr/> 7	<hr/> 298

Ut clauses form about half of the occurrences except in Spartian, where they are less than one-third, while he uses *ad* more freely than do the other writers. Slight differences are also noticeable in the use of *causa* and *gratia*. Excluding Vulc. Gall., whose work is very limited, all but one have the fut. part., while two do not use the supine. The gerundive is freely used by all excepting Lampridius, it being most noticeable in the works of Capitolinus.

C. *Aurelius Victor.*

The following table gives the number of occurrences for the different works passing under the name of Aurelius Victor:

	Origo Gent.	De Vir. Ill.	De Caess.	Epit.	
ad,	5	11	12	7	35
ut,	4	15	2	2	23
qui,	3	6	1	1	11
quo,	2	0	0	0	2
supine,	3	0	2		5
gratia,	5	2	2	0	9
fut. part.,	0	0	1	0	1
gerundive,	4	6	0	2	12
	<hr/> 26	<hr/> 40	<hr/> 20	<hr/> 12	<hr/> 98

The use of *gratia* is common to all. The supine is found in but two, and is very likely due to the sources followed. The future part. expressing finality occurs but once, de Caess. 6, 3. The *gerundive* is not used in the de Caess. The last two of the works seem to be more nearly related to each other than to the first two, though this may be due to the utilization of common sources. The de Vir. Ill. and the Origo Gent. are akin in subject-matter and have about the same relative number of each form as might be expected, though there is a noticeable difference in the use of *quo* and the supine, and considerable difference in the use of *gratia* and of *ut*.

IV.—SUMMARY.

The final table gives the number of occurrences for each of the writers, and also the per cent. of occurrences for each of the forms used to express finality. Owing to the mass of examples in Livy the average per cent. does not vary far from his, the widest divergence being in the case of *ad*. In some of the writers a low per cent. for one form is balanced by a high per cent. for another. This is the case with *ad* and *causa* in Caesar, *ad* and the supine in Sallust, *ad* and *ut* in Velleius, *ad* and the gen. and dat. of the ger. in Tacitus, and *ut* and *quo* in Tacitus. However, in the last seven on the list, a high per cent. of one form is balanced by a low per cent. for a number of the others. Some of the most marked deviations from the general average are to be found in the writers in which there are comparatively few occurrences. Rejecting half a dozen in which there are the fewest occurrences, in the remainder, the difference between the highest and the lowest per cent. is about .300 for *ut*, .250 for *ad*, .155 for *qui*, and .180 for *quo*. *Causa* with the ger. is not used by Curtius and Florus to express design, though the former has the nom. with the ger. 6, 11, 32; 7, 1, 39. After the time of Livy, the per cent. for the supine in the most important writers does not rise above .03, though Dict. Cret., one of the minor writers, has the largest per cent. of them all. The per cent. for *quo*, *causa*, supine, fut. part. and gerundive is nearly the same, yet more than four-fifths of the participles are to be found in four writers, and nearly one-half of them in one, Ammianus Marcellinus, though they occur in all but Caesar and Nepos. Attention has already been called to the usage of the different writers with reference to *causa* and *gratia* and of *quo* without a comparative. The examples given under each section

indicate the practical equivalence of the different forms, and variations from the general average can be well explained by differ-

	ut.	ad.	qui.	quo.	causa.	Supine.	Fut. Part.	Gerundive.	Dat. Ger.	Gen. Ger.	
Caesar,	109	63	57	32	87	16	—	7		1	372
Sallust,	26	16	10	24	13	29	3	3		4	128
Nepos,	34	27	21	18	6	20	—	8			134
Livy,	830	937	251	78	115	156	31	73	9	4	2484
Velleius,	7	17	2	4	5	—	4	3			42
Curtius,	106	89	49	23	—	3	52	5	6		333
Val. Max.,	139	117	7	55	34	10	10	42			414
Justinus,	78	96	35	6	5	8	30	18	1		277
Tacitus,	188	83	98	81	7	12	14	10	75	9	577
Suetonius,	67	91	25	49	22	4	10	27	5		300
Florus,	32	9	2	3	—	1	2	9			58
Amm. Marc.,	197	141	9	5	22	14	150	32	3		573
Hist. Aug.	151	68	14	10	13	4	7	31			298
Aur. Vict.,	23	35	11	2	9	5	1	12	1	2	101
Eutropius,	21	13	3	2	1	—	1	3			44
Dares,	28	7	6	—	—	3	1	1			46
Dict. Cret.,	8	28	3	7	6	33	2	8			95
Totals,	2044	1837	603	399	345	318	318	292	100	20	6276

	ut.	ad.	qui.	quo.	causa.	Supine.	Fut. Part.	Gerundive.	Dat. Ger.	Gen. Ger.	
Caesar,	.293	.169	.153	.086	.234	.043		.019			.003
Sallust,	.203	.125	.079	.188	.101	.227	.023	.023			.031
Nepos,	.254	.201	.157	.134	.044	.149		.060			
Livy,	.334	.377	.101	.031	.046	.063	.013	.029	.004		.002
Velleius,	.167	.405	.047	.096	.119	—	.096	.070			
Curtius,	.319	.268	.148	.069	—	.009	.154	.014	.018		—
Val. Max.,	.336	.273	.015	.133	.080	.024	.024	.102			
Justinus,	.281	.347	.125	.022	.018	.029	.107	.066	.004		
Tacitus,	.326	.144	.170	.140	.012	.021	.022	.018	.130		.016
Suetonius,	.223	.304	.083	.163	.073	.014	.033	.090	.017		
Florus,	.551	.155	.034	.051		.018	.035	.155			
Amm. Marc.,	.344	.246	.016	.008	.039	.024	.262	.056	.005		
Hist. Aug.,	.507	.228	.047	.033	.043	.014	.023	.104			
Aur. Vict.,	.228	.347	.109	.019	.089	.049	.010	.118	.010		.020
Eutropius,	.477	.295	.068	.045	.023		.023	.068			
Dares,	.609	.152	.130			.065	.022	.022			
Dict. Cret.,	.084	.294	.031	.074	.063	.347	.021	.084			
Average,	.3258	.2928	.0961	.0636	.0555	.0507	.0507	.0465	.0160		.0031

ences in subject-matter calling for the use of different verbs by the individual writers.

Of the writers examined, Sallust certainly shows the greatest freedom, especially in his later works. Instances of *quo* without a comparative, of the genitive of the ger. without *causa*, and of the future participle expressing design, are also rather common in Tacitus, but they appear in his works as the result of the influence of Sallust, and his only noticeable variation from other writers is his use of the dative of the gerund and gerundive, of which only a comparatively few examples occur in other writers. Some of the writers examined are so dependent on earlier sources that the usage of each is really the reflection of the usage of many writers, and the results are not really assignable to a single writer. The later writers show but few points of interest, the most interesting one being Dictys Cretensis, noticeable for his archaistic use of the supine, and of *gratia* instead of *causa*.

ILL. WESLEYAN UNIV., BLOOMINGTON, ILL.

R. B. STEELE.

III.—A PRE-VARRONIAN CHAPTER OF ROMAN LITERARY HISTORY.

The pre-eminence of Varro among the scholarly figures of Roman antiquity has undoubtedly led to an exaggerated estimate of the value of his methods and the significance of his results. But while the ever-advancing investigation of Roman literature reveals the hand of Varro in methods which are foolish and in results which are impossible, on the other hand it discloses equally his enormous superiority to the school of philological and antiquarian studies which he supplanted and out of which he came. This very pre-eminence has made the task of separating Varronian from pre-Varronian views one of the greatest difficulty; but obviously such a separation is of supreme importance, not only for a just estimate of Varro, but also for a real comprehension of the development of philological studies at Rome, and in the present paper it is my purpose to attempt to distinguish two strata in the history of these studies, which have hitherto been obscurely merged in each other or quite identified.

The beginnings of literary and grammatical studies at Rome are described by Suetonius in the interesting historical introduction to his treatise *De grammaticis*. After explaining that the earliest scholars were poets of foreign birth who only translated Greek writers or gave readings of their own compositions, he goes on to narrate how the first decisive impulse to these studies was derived from the lectures of Crates of Mallus, who came as an ambassador from King Attalus of Pergamon, very soon after the death of Ennius (169 B. C.),¹ *ac nostris fuit exemplo ad imitandum: hactenus tamen imitati, ut carmina parum adhuc divulgata vel defunctorum amicorum vel si quorum aliorum probassent, diligentius retractarent ac legendo commendoque et ceteris nota facerent*. Thereupon follow several examples of the early editorial activity that was thus inaugurated,

¹ On the inaccurate statement of Suetonius, since the reign of Attalus II (Philadelphus) did not begin until 159 B. C., see Leo, *Plautinische Forschungen*, p. 29, note I.

the first of which will suffice for illustration, setting forth how *C. Octavius Lampadio Naevii Punicum bellum, quod uno volumine et continenti scriptura expositum divisit in septem libros*. That this division bears some relation to Crates' division of the Homeric poems is a not improbable conjecture,¹ and it will serve to illustrate the method of the literary study inaugurated by the example of Crates and the character of the 'imitation' of his Roman disciples. Although the words of Suetonius only make specific reference to editorial and interpretative studies (*retractant, legendo, commentando*), we may confidently assume that the example of Crates afforded stimulus to the beginnings of literary history, aside from the elements of it which are implied in the preparation of the critical edition of antiquity, viz. the literary and historical introduction.² For that Crates was the author of a treatise *περὶ κωμῳδίας* at least (whether a separate work or an introduction to his commentary on Aristophanes) is quite certain, and his lectures would naturally have included such subjects as well as technical interpretation and criticism.

But the Romans were as yet still in leading strings in literature, and how far therefore removed from any naturally developed critical spirit, not to say sound method in its application, some of the products of these earlier Roman studies are eloquent witnesses. Perhaps a more childish example is not afforded than the arguments by which Accius demonstrated that Hesiod was older than Homer: *quod Homerus, inquit, cum in principio carminis Achillem esse filium Pelei diceret, quis esset Peleus non addidit; quam rem procul dubio dixisset, nisi ab Hesiodo iam dictum videret*, and a similar argument drawn from the monstrosity of the single-eyed Cyclops follows. Inasmuch as the chapter of Gellius (III 11) which affords us this specimen of the philology of Accius begins and ends with Varro's treatment of the questions concerning the age and the birthplace of Homer, from the first book *De imaginibus*, it is quite certain that here, as elsewhere (III 3, 9: *M. Varro in libro de comoediis Plautinis primo Accii verba haec ponit*), Gellius owes his knowledge of the earlier critic to Varro himself, and that the passage of Accius was cited in the descriptive text of the *Imagines* to be refuted by the documentary

¹ Hillscher, *Hominum litteratorum etc. hist. crit.*, in *Jhbb. für Phil.*, Supplementband XVIII (1892), p. 358, and cf. Susemihl, *Gesch. d. gr. Lit.*, vol. II, p. 10 (note 50).

² Cf. Wilamowitz, *Herakles* (ed. I), vol. I, p. 144 ff.

evidence which Varro brought to bear upon the point (*ex epigrammate in tripode . . . qui in monte Helicone ab Hesiodo positus traditur*) to show *uter prior sit natus parum constare . . . , sed non esse dubium quin aliquo tempore eodem vixerint*. Another example in which we find Varro citing and correcting the view of Accius we shall have occasion to examine in more detail presently. Equally illustrative of the immaturity of this early criticism is the well-known fact of its extraordinarily imitative character. This was conspicuous not only in external features, such as the adoption of technical terms and the entire acceptance of classifications of all kinds, but also in the reproduction of much which in the nature of things must have been inapplicable as depending upon totally different historical and social conditions. I do not mean to imply that Roman scholars ever entirely abandoned this procedure, and ample illustration of trivial and imitative criticism is afforded by examples that are Varronian and post-Varronian.¹ But Varro in this field as elsewhere corrected what he could, and by appeal to the evidence of the literature itself, and especially by his chronological investigations in the public documents, succeeded in demolishing many received opinions of his day.

One of the most remarkable and extensive examples of the imitative literary history to which I have alluded, I pointed out in an earlier number of this Journal (vol. XV, pp. 1-30), showing that the dramatic *satyra* described by Livy (VII 2) was but an

¹ An illustration from late antiquity, to which I believe attention has never been called, may not be out of place here. In the Pseudo-Acronian preface to the scholia on the Sermones of Horace, the author says (Hauthal, II, p. 3): *Satira istius (sc. Horatii) inter Lucilii satiram est et Iuvenalis media, nam et asperitatem habet quam Lucilius, et suavitatem quam Iuvenalis mixtam in suo carmine*. Here the *suavitas Iuvenalis* will cause amusement and perhaps perplexity, if we were not in the habit of dismissing lightly the absurdities of the scholiast without much consideration. But the extraordinary characterization of Juvenal is not without its explanation, for it is only the consistent product—surprising, to be sure—of an unfaltering effort to force Latin writers into a rubric fixed by Greek literary criticism. The second treatise *περί κωμωδίας* attributed to one Platonius (in Dübner's Scholia in Aristoph., no. II, p. xiv) betrays the source, in its concluding words concerning the three great masters of the old comedy: *ὁ δὲ Ἀριστοφάνης τὸν μέσον ἐλήλακε τῶν ἀνδρῶν χαρακτήρα. οὔτε γὰρ πικρὸς λίαν ἐστὶν ὥσπερ ὁ Κρατῖνος, οὔτε χαρίεις ὥσπερ ὁ Εὐπόλις, ἀλλ' ἔχει καὶ πρὸς τοὺς ἀμαρτάνοντας τὸ σφοδρὸν τοῦ Κρατίνου καὶ τὸ τῆς ἐπιτρεχούσης χάριτος Εὐπόλιδος*.

assumed Roman analogue to the old Greek comedy, and that the whole narrative of Livy (and of the related description in Horace, Epp. II 1, 145-160) reproduces essentially and even in detail the Aristotelian sketch of Attic comedy. The difficult but important question of the source of this piece of artificial history I left unanswered, merely calling attention to some of the problems involved in its solution (l. c., p. 30 and note). What I there expressed tentatively and only by way of conjecture, I shall here undertake to prove, viz. that the whole description goes back of Varro to some "one of his less critical predecessors" (ibid.). I shall not urge as ground for my contention "that the assumption is so monstrously unhistorical that one is inclined to doubt whether Varro can have been the author of it" (ibid.)—though this consideration is not without significance—but I shall confine myself rather to concrete arguments, in part of a chronological character. Here, as elsewhere, we shall find an earlier view, the product of literary history in its infancy, set aside by the chronological and documentary investigations of Varro.

That Varro is the common source of Livy and Horace has been and is, so far as I know, the undisputed opinion of a number of very eminent scholars who have considered the question. But none of them has gone further than to affirm that he is the only natural source to assume, and that we cannot well attribute it to another. Jahn, in *Hermes*, vol. II (1867), p. 225, after characterizing the chapter as the "Résumé der Combination eines Grammatikers," says very briefly: "am nächsten liegt es wohl an Varro *De originibus scaenicis* zu denken." Leo in the same journal, vol. XXIV (1889), p. 76, referring to Jahn's identification of the source, says with more confidence: "Man darf wohl behaupten das für Livius eine andere Quelle so wenig wahrscheinlich ist, wie für diese Darstellung ein anderer Ursprung."¹ Few, I imagine, any longer doubt that the chapter is the constructive work of imitative literary history and not the authentic record of facts.² But that Varro must be assumed as

¹So also Kiessling ad Hor. Epp. II 1, 139. But less confidently, Hor. Satiren, p. vii: "Varro oder wer sonst der Gewährsmann von Livius (VII 2) ... ist." Cf. in addition Leo, *Plautinische Forsch.*, p. 64.

²But cf. Dietrich, *Pulcinella* (Leipzig, 1897), p. 80, note, and Pease, in *Harper's Dictionary of Classical Literature*, etc. (New York, 1897), article *Satire*.

its source is not required by any evidence of the chapter itself and is a conclusion no more necessary than would be the assumption that there were no earlier philologists to whom it could be referred. If, therefore, it can be shown that this narrative contains elements which are irreconcilable with the known results of Varro's investigations, and even presents views which he distinctly refuted, we shall be compelled to assign the chapter to a pre-Varronian source, and, as will be seen, we shall not be without a clue to a closer identification.

We have seen above how by appeal to documentary evidence Varro refuted the trivial arguments of Accius concerning the time of Hesiod. Another conspicuous example of the same kind, which goes to the very heart of the question in hand, is preserved for us by Cicero in the *Brutus* (72). There, on the authority of Atticus in his *Liber annalis*, then but recently published, Cicero states: *atqui hic (Livius) primus fabulam C. Claudio et M. Tuditano consulibus docuit anno ipso ante, quam natus est Ennius (= 240 B. C.) . . . ut hic ait quem nos sequimur,—est enim inter scriptores de numero annorum controversia—Accius autem a Q. Maximo quintum consule (209 B. C.) captum Tarento scripsit Livium annis XXX post, quam eum fabulam docuisse et Atticus scribit et nos in antiquis commentariis invenimus; docuisse autem fabulam annis post XI C. Cornelio Q. Minucio consulibus (197 B. C.) ludis Inventatis, quos Salinator Senensi proelio voverat: in quo tantus error Accii fuit, ut his consulibus XL annos natus Ennius fuerit; cui si aequalis fuerit Livius, minor fuit aliquanto is qui primus fabulam dedit, quam ei qui multas docuerant ante hos consules (197 B. C.), et Plautus et Naevius.* The correction of Accius' mistake is not of course due to Atticus, who in this work certainly only aimed to summarize the results of others, but to Varro, as Clinton (*Fasti Hell.*, vol. III, Int. XIX) saw and as Leo has recently pointed out (*Plaut. Forsch.*, p. 58), comparing Gellius, XVII 21, 42, who gives the corrected date for the first production of plays at Rome and states that Ennius was born in the subsequent year on the authority of *M. Varro in primo de poetis libro*. But the error of Accius is not an isolated one, as Leo has very admirably shown (l. c.) by evidence of another example of the same mistake contained in the chapter of Gellius cited: *eodem anno (235 B. C.) C. Naevius poeta fabulas apud populum dedit, quem M. Varro in libro de poetis primo stipendia fecisse ait bello Poenico primo, idque ipsum Naevium*

dicere in eo carmine quod de eodem bello scripsit. That Naevius was older than was usually believed, Varro was thus able to prove out of the *Bellum Poenicum* itself, and he adduces this fact in criticism of the view which follows, viz. *Porcius autem Licinus serius poeticam Romae coepisse dicit in his versibus:*

*Poenico bello secundo Musa pinnato gradu
Intulit se bellicosam in Romuli gentem feram.*

Leo has made it very clear that these verses do not refer to a new period in Roman poetry inaugurated by Ennius, as is commonly interpreted, but reveal rather that their author was of the opinion that the beginnings of Roman poetry belonged to the period of the second Punic war. But doubters there will be, who will question on the one hand this interpretation of the verses of Porcius, or admitting that they refer to the actual beginnings, will deny that the words *Poenico bello secundo* need bring us so far down as the chronology of Accius requires. To show, therefore, that the blunder of Accius does not stand alone (as seems to be the current opinion), but represents a widely diffused pre-Varronian conception of the early literary chronology, let us see what other evidence can be brought to bear upon the question.

In the first place, while it may be conceivable that the egregious blunder of Accius was an individual one and so conspicuously erroneous as to be without important effect upon his own or subsequent times, and while it may also be conceivable that Varro would have taken pains to refute such an isolated aberration, it is not conceivable that Atticus in a brief historical summary would have devoted his attention to the detailed refutation of such an error. But his mention of it (not dogmatically, but with detailed evidence) is the clearest indication of the radical importance of Varro's correction in demolishing a generally accepted theory of Roman literary chronology. If further proof of this kind is desired we have it in the fact that Cicero takes up the point irrelevantly (*haec si minus apta videntur huic sermoni*, *ibid.* 74), but lured on by the novelty and interest of the disclosures which Atticus' book contained (v. q. sq. *ibid.*). But turning to more concrete evidence, let us examine *De senectute* 50, where Cato, in illustration of the statement *si vero habet aliquod tamquam pabulum studii atque doctrinae, nihil est otiosa senectute iucundius*, enumerates examples from Roman history: (*in studio*

dimetiendi caeli) Gallus, (*in levioribus studiis*) quam gaudebat bello suo Punico Naevius, quam Truculento Plautus, quam Pseudolo: vidi etiam senem Livium, qui cum sex annis ante quam ego natus sum fabulam docuisset Centone Tuditanoque consulibus, usque ad adulescentiam meam processit aetate. In this passage the reference to the age of Livius and to the time of the production of his first play is, so far as I know, looked upon merely as one of the didactic digressions in which the Cato Major is rich. And yet, when attention is called to it in connection with the refutation of Accius' error in the Brutus, it will be seen very clearly that the reason for the information given is to justify the designation of Livius as *senex* in the mouth of Cato, and thus to refute a popular error. For if Livius had produced his first play in 197, he would presumably have been a man no older (or even younger) than Cato himself, and still a young man at the end of his career. In order, therefore, to furnish an illustration of Cato's point (*eos omnes quos commemoravi, his studiis flagrantis senes vidimus*, *ibid.*) it was necessary to indicate the true chronological relation of Livius to Cato, and to the other poets mentioned. Thus this digression, which otherwise would seem to furnish purely gratuitous information such as is not attached to any of the other illustrations, finds a complete explanation. Once again Cicero touches on the matter in the Tusc. Disp. I 3, giving the corrected date of Livius and his relation to Ennius, Plautus and Naevius, but elsewhere he does not make mention of him (with the exception of the *Liviani modi* in De leg. II 39, and the *Livianae fabulae* in Brutus 71, out of which the discussion in 72 arises). So we see that his interest in Livius was distinctly subordinated to the chronological novelties which Varro's investigation had attached to his name.

Another witness to a false chronology, similar to, if not identical with, that of Accius, was cited by Madvig, in his *Commentatio de L. Attii didascalici*, in 1831 (*Opusc. ed. alt.*, p. 82). We have seen above that Accius believed that the first play of Livius was produced in the year 197 at the *ludi Iuventatis*, given in accordance with the vow of Livius Salinator on his victory at Sena (207). The same event is referred to the year 191 by Livy (XXXVI 36, 5 ff.): *item Iuventatis aedem in circo maximo C. Licinius Lucullus duumvir dedicavit. voverat eam sexdecim annis ante M. Livius consul. . . . huius quoque dedicandae causa ludi facti et omnia cum maiore religione facta, quod novum cum Antiocho instabat bellum.* This description is pre-

ceded by the narrative of the dedication in the same year (191) of the temple of the *magna mater Idaea* (ibid. 4): *Dedicavit eam M. Iunius Brutus, ludique ob dedicationem eius facti, quos primos scaenicos fuisse Antias Valerius est auctor, Megalesia appellatos*. The words obviously "aliam sententiam non habent, nisi hos ludos primos omnino scaenicos fuisse, appellatos autem Megalesia" (Madvig, l. c., and cf. Weissenborn ad loc.). What Livy's attitude toward the statement is we should gladly know, but we do not learn. That the phrase *Antias Valerius auctor est* implies dissent on Livy's part is by no means the case,¹ as Weissenborn here suggests, but on the other hand we need not urge that it implies unqualified acceptance of the statement. In regard to the origin of the error of Valerius Antias there are many possibilities, and Madvig (l. c., note) has presented, with much ingenuity and learning, a plausible (*veri similem, si non veram*) explanation. I should prefer a less intricate hypothesis, and starting with the presumption of Accius' acknowledged authority in matters of dramatic history, it would seem to me most natural to suspect that a divergence of authorities concerning the date of the *ludi Iuventatis* of Salinator was the source of the error. Valerius, let us assume, had it from Accius that the first play of Livius was produced at the *ludi Iuventatis*, but he found these *ludi* in some source transferred to the year 191. Now the Megalesia of this year on the dedication of the temple of the Magna Mater so far eclipsed all previous spectacles of the kind at Rome, that it seemed more reasonable to associate the first *ludi scaenici* with this celebration rather than with the more modest *ludi Iuventatis*. Still "confusio quaedam in tota hac re talis effecta est, ut errorum seriem vix persequi possimus" (Madvig, l. c.). But the essential thing for our present purpose is clear enough, viz. that Valerius Antias presents a chronology of similar incorrectness to that of Accius, and that Livy was not at pains to refute so remarkable an error.

To gather up at this point all the evidence for the diffusion of the chronology of Accius, I add here the entry of St. Jerome against the year 187 B. C.: *Livius tragoediarum scriptor clarus habetur*. The relationship between this statement and the chronology of Accius was pointed out by C. F. Hermann in a Göttingen program of 1848 (p. 3), and, as will be seen, it fits

¹As examination of Livy's use of the formula *auctor est* (v. Fügner, *Lex. Liv.*, s. v.) will reveal.

admirably. The date 187 is gained not unnaturally by adding ten years to the time of his first play, as in a similar manner the 'floruit' of Caecilius is fixed by going back ten years from the time of his death.

This somewhat protracted review of the literary chronology of Accius has not, I hope, been without independent value as an illustration of one phase of pre-Varronian literary history. Through it, moreover, we have gained a vantage point that was necessary for the proper understanding of a passage that will lead us near our goal in ascertaining the *provenance* of Livy's chapter. That Horace's similar description in the letter to Augustus, vss. 145-160, is derived from the same source as Livy's is, I believe, universally conceded. There, it will be recalled,¹ the progressive development of a native comedy, through the three stages of the (1) *fescennina licentia* (φαλλικά), (2) the *aperta rabies* (προφανῶς σκώπτειν), and (3) the artistic drama designed to please (*delectare*, τέρπειν) and not to abuse (*benedicere* = *non maledicere*, μὴ λυπεῖν) is described, corresponding closely to the Aristotelian outlines of the development of Attic comedy. The description concludes:

- 156 *Graecia capta ferum victorem cepit et artis
intulit agresti Latio. Sic horridus ille
defluxit numerus Saturnius et grave virus
munditiae pepulere; sed in longum tamen aevum*
160 *manserunt hodieque manent vestigia ruris.
Serus enim Graecis admovit acumina chartis
et post Punica bella quietus quaerere coepit,
quid Sophocles et Thespis et Aeschylus utile ferrent:
templavit quoque rem, si digne vertere posset,*
165 *et placuit sibi, natura sublimis et acer.*

I have said before, in considering these lines (l. c., p. 25), that it would seem most natural to refer *Graecia capta* to the conquest of Magna Graecia; but in the light of what I have since learned concerning the opinion which prevailed before Varro of the period to which Livius Andronicus belonged, with the consequent advancement of the whole literary chronology of the time by a generation, I now doubt if that interpretation be the natural or correct one. Kiessling says of the pointedly paradoxical words: *Graecia capta . . . victorem cepit*—"a commonplace first uttered

¹See above, p. 288, and my article on 'The Dramatic Satura and the Old Comedy at Rome,' in this Journal, vol. XV (1894), p. 20 ff.

apparently by Cato, and afterward oft repeated, in which Horace is thinking of the introduction of elements of Greek civilization that followed on the subjugation of Magna Graecia." While the words are general, their special application of course is to the introduction of letters, and accordingly the time referred to will depend upon the conception that Horace had of the period to which Livius Andronicus belonged. Thus Kiessling, not doubting that Horace would place his first play in 240 B. C., interprets the words as just quoted, adding: "war doch Livius Andronicus ein kriegsgefangener Grieche" (*captus Graecus*). His conception of the passage and its relation to Livius Andronicus is certainly correct, but he has erred in naming the period referred to in the words *Graecia capta*; for is Horace following the corrected chronology of Varro?

The utterance of Cato, which Horace here adapts to the person of Livius Andronicus as the inaugurator of literary studies at Rome, is preserved for us in the report of the famous speech which he delivered against the abrogation of the *lex Oppia* in 195 B. C.: *eo plus horreo, ne illae magis res nos ceperint quam nos illas. infesta, mihi credite, signa ab Syracusis illata sunt huic urbi* (Livy, XXXIV 4, 4). I have quoted this passage for the sake of comparing with it the comment of Livy on the bringing to Rome of the spoils of Syracuse after its capture in 212 B. C.: *ceterum inde primum initium mirandi Graecarum artium opera* (XXV 40, 2). From these two passages we have clear evidence of the time to which the words of Horace would naturally carry the mind of the Roman reader. That Horace was at liberty to give them another application in point of time is of course true, but we shall see that he saw no occasion for doing so. The origin of the catch-word *Graecia capta . . . cepit* carries us to the period of the end of the second Punic war, and—while recognizing that the words do not allude so much to any specific stage in the subjugation of Greece, as to a period in the growing culture of Rome—the text of Horace refers us to the same time, *post Punica bella*. *Serus* takes up *ferum victorem* again, after the intervening summary (*sic horridus ille ff.*) of the preceding description, and so binds *intulit artes* closely together with *Graecis admovit acumina chartis*. The two expressions are but different aspects of the same thought, and cannot be separated in point of time. *Intulit artes* is a figurative expression (and especially as here used of literature, which is not a commodity that can be imported and stored and drawn upon when

desired), which is interpreted by the words *admovit acumina chartis*. Horace's point of view and form of expression are similar to the verses of Porcius Licinus already cited (*Poenico bello secundo musa pinnato gradu || intulit se bellicosam in Romuli gentem feram*).

Turning now to the words which follow :

*et post Punica bella quietus quaerere coepit
quid Sophocles et Thespis et Aeschylus utile ferrent.
templavit quoque rem, si digne vertere posset, etc.*

there is nothing longer to prevent us from interpreting them literally and without putting into them anything more than their face value. What Horace says is that the very beginnings of Roman literature, and specifically of Roman tragedy, fell in the lull that followed the Punic wars, i. e. the second Punic war. He is not therefore thinking of Ennius "als den Begründer der römischen hellenisierenden Dichtung und den ältesten in der Reihe der klassischen Tragiker Roms" (Kiessling), but of the whole group of earliest writers—Livius Andronicus (whom he believed, following Accius and the current chronology in which he had been brought up, to have begun his activity at the end of the second Punic war), Naevius and Ennius, following each other in close succession and nearly contemporary.¹ We may fairly insist that the words denote actual beginnings, for *quaerere coepit* certainly admits of no other natural explanation. That is even a step further back than the beginning, it is the reflection that precedes the undertaking; *templavit rem*, the earliest essays, before the possibility of accomplishment had been established (*si digne vertere posset*); *placuit sibi* etc., the success with which the first efforts met. That there is any ground for believing that Horace is here referring to Ennius and his time, passing over as unworthy of notice his predecessors in literature, may be emphatically denied. Horace's criticism in this letter and elsewhere is directed against all that the patriotic critics cherished. Accordingly, in verses 50-62 he reviews impartially and shows that the critics cherished (*ut critici dicunt*) impartially all the great poets

¹ It is to refute this view, which was evidently a current one, and to make clear the chronological relations that Cicero in *Tusc.* I 3 says: *Livius . . . qui fuit maior natu quam Plautus et Naevius*. These words have seemed to Cicero's critics so otiose and needless that modern editors almost without exception have eliminated them as the stupid gloss of a copyist. They are essential to the whole argument.

from Livius to Afranius. If Horace were the friend and advocate of Ennius we might grant that he could fairly assume on the part of his readers acquaintance with the fact that he placed Ennius in a different category and dated the beginnings of Roman poetry from him, ignoring all that went before. But of course that is not the case either here or in the *Ars Poetica* (259 ff.). Ennius is everywhere comprehended in the same criticism with the rest.¹ We must conclude, therefore, that Horace's words can only be referred to the actual beginnings of Roman tragedy. The placing of these after the second Punic war reveals that Horace follows the older Accian chronology, dating the first play of Livius in 197 B. C. Against this conclusion it may be urged that as Horace has elsewhere in this letter (50-62) made obvious reference to Varronian studies, so here we should expect him to follow the corrected chronology of Varro. But Horace is a poet and but little concerned with Varro's chronological inquiries, and it will not seem strange that writing as late as 14 B. C. (Vahlen) he should reproduce a view which had been universally held in his boyhood and which doubtless continued to be the prevailing popular opinion long after it had been refuted by Varro; just as Livy, writing at about the same time,² reports without comment or wonder the statement of Valerius Antias, that the first *ludi*

¹ It is probable that there was a school of critics at Rome who looked upon Ennius as the father and source of artistic poetry at Rome, following the arrogant pretensions of Ennius himself, echoed again in Lucretius and in Varro (in citation), *Sat. Menip.* 356, Büch. But the verses of Porcius Licinus are not to be cited in evidence of it, as Leo has very convincingly shown (v. supra, p. 290), and to force Cicero into line with this point of view, as Büttner does (*Porc. Lic.* [Leipz. 1893], p. 50 ff. and p. 62), is only an illustration of the lengths to which special pleading will go. Not to mention Brutus 75 and 76, in which Cicero expressly defends Naevius against the depreciation of Ennius (where Büttner can only express amazement at the inconsistency of Cicero (l. c., p. 68)), Cicero speaks in the warmest praise of his language in *De orat.* III 45 (an interesting and instructive passage), and *Orator* 155 only indicates that hiatus was more frequent in Naevius than in Ennius. From what other passages a judgment of Cicero on Naevius can be derived I do not know. *Sit Ennius sane, ut est certe, perfectior (quam Naevius)*, is Cicero's sober verdict (Brutus 76), as far removed from ignoring the one as from exalting the other. The patriotic critics of Varro's type in the middle of the first century had lost all such distinctions as the arrogant claims of Ennius may have given rise to, in universal admiration of all the early writers.

² If, as is assumed, Livy's history was produced at the rate of from three to four books a year, the thirty-sixth book would fall in the neighborhood of 16-13 B. C.

scaenici fell as late as 191. Furthermore, Horace's allusions to Varro's studies in this letter are for the sake of criticising and ridiculing them, and therefore afford no ground for assuming that in the parts of his letter which have nothing to do with the literary judgments of Varro and his school, any attention should be paid to the results of Varronian investigation.

But having found in these verses of Horace clear evidence of pre-Varronian chronology, it is in itself almost conclusive evidence that the preceding account of the development of a native comedy at Rome is also pre-Varronian. For not only is the continuity of narrative unbroken, but it will be possible to show that the false chronology and the whole theory of a native drama before Livius Andronicus are intimately related to each other. In considering this question before, I suggested that in addition to the motive of mere parallelism, there may have been present a certain aetiological element in constructing an *ἀρχαία κωμῳδία* for the sake of explaining the *ὀνομαστὶ κωμῳδεῖν* of Naevius. That both of these elements had some influence in determining the character of the literary history thus constructed I still hold, but the decisive impulse I now see came from another source.

Turning again to Accius, the author of the false chronology which Horace reveals, it was possible for him to have known men whose memory went back to the literary figures active in Rome at the end of the third century. How confused and vague was the information concerning these men and their relationship to each other in point of time we have already seen. Still, we must believe that some traditions which reflected the true relations survived, even though exact information was wanting, and thus, although Accius could date Livius Andronicus' first play in 197, it is still probable that he considered him the earliest historical figure in the history of the Roman drama and of Roman literature.¹ But that he should have believed that there was no drama

¹ I say 'probable' advisedly and aware that it is by no means certain; but the point is not essential to my theory of the situation, which in some respects would gain in simplicity if we could show that Accius believed Naevius to be the earlier. It seems to me, however, *a priori* probable that the chronology would have suffered change more easily than the relationship in point of time of the two men to each other, and so the fact of Livius' absolute priority to all others was less likely to be lost than the date of his first play. Furthermore, the passage of Valerius Antias above cited is evidence that the first play of Livius was believed by some to have inaugurated the first *ludi scaenici*, and hence he must have been held to be antecedent to Naevius as a dramatic poet. Evidence of the opposite view might be derived from Cic.

at Rome earlier than this date is quite inconceivable, when we reflect that men still living in Accius' youth would have been able to recall such performances from childhood memories. But Accius was true to his method, though his results must have caused him perplexity. So having fixed on the most distinguished of the Livii as the master of Livius Andronicus, and the capture of Tarentum (209) as the occasion of his falling into the hands of the Romans, Accius carried through his system consistently and fixed the first play of Livius in 197. Accordingly Naevius was also placed much too late, an error which was likewise left for Varro to correct on the authority of Naevius himself (v. *supra*, p. 290). Accius had thus apparently a definite but erroneous conception of the place of Livius in the history of Roman literature. He could give no name in the history of drama earlier than Livius, for tradition had correctly preserved the fact of his priority to all others, and yet there was a period antecedent to 197 during which there must have been oral and perhaps written tradition of the production of plays. (Documentary evidence of them there was also in the aedile's archives, but this source was closed to the ignorance and carelessness of Accius, as to subsequent scholars, until Varro's investigations brought it to light.) The problem, therefore, which confronted Accius was to account satisfactorily for this period, in the absence of documentary evidence and on the basis of report alone. His chronological inquiries had fixed the first play of Livius in 197. He was thus probably prevented from placing Naevius earlier. In consequence a certain period antecedent to 197, concerning which a more or less distinct tradition must have existed, belonged to dramatic history and yet was apparently without record. With Livius Andronicus, further, he knew that the history of the *νεία* at Rome began; therefore, if there was a period of dramatic history antecedent to Livius, what was the nature of the comedy of this period? To a Roman philologian moving emulously along the lines laid down by his Greek masters there could be, *κατὰ τὸ εἶδος καὶ τὸ ἀναγκαῖον*, but one answer—an *ἀρχαία κωμῳδία*, such as the Greek literary historians described,

Tusc. I 3: *Livius . . . qui fuit maior natu quam Plautus et Naevius* (where see context). But these words may be referred to a refutation of the notion that Livius was a contemporary of these men, as well as of the opinion that he was younger. That Accius must have thought of all these poets as being nearly contemporary is obvious. Cf. Brutus 72: (*Ennius*), *cui si aequalis fuerit Livius*, etc., and p. 295, note, above.

and before that, the elements out of which it grew. Even if he felt that the law of the Twelve Tables forbidding anything like the personal attack of the old comedy would stand in the way of such an assumption, he had the tradition of Naevius' licence of speech on which to build, and he might also remember that many laws were passed at Athens restricting the freedom of speech in comedy, before the stage of Aristophanes was deserted. I have put the whole situation hypothetically, because from the proximity of Accius to the period in question it cannot well have been otherwise. But here we are not restricted to conjecture on probability of an *a priori* kind. We have the clearest evidence from about the time of Accius that the problem must have presented itself to him in somewhat such a manner as described, and that he must have been confronted with a period of dramatic history for which to account, in the mere fact that the annalistic source of Livy and Verrius Flaccus (Festus, p. 326) placed the first *ludi scaenici* in 365 B. C. (Verrius Flaccus 359 B. C.). Now, a history that assigned the *ludi* to that date was inevitably challenged to outline the history of the drama that was performed at them, down to the point of junction with Livius and recorded history. Working back in this manner the Roman literary historian would naturally assume the same steps leading up to the more highly organized drama as he found in his Greek sources. I say naturally, for the whole history of Roman philological studies reveals exactly such methods of work, and they do not require illustration at this point. There was little need of adaptation of the Greek description to Roman conditions, for there was clearly a most convenient absence of facts to be fitted by any such adapted history.

Thus an account of a drama before Livius was constructed, which is preserved for us in two important versions, that of Livy and that of Horace. It narrated with the same brevity of characterization which belongs to the earliest Greek treatises *περὶ κωμῳδίας* the history of comedy through the successive stages of the *φαλλικά* (*fescennina*), from which comedy took its rise, and of the old comedy, with its open invective (*satura*, *aperta rabies*), down to the point of junction with recorded history as this had been fixed by Accius. This point was made coincident with the transition from the old to the new comedy, and here the description of Livy (VII 2, 8) affords us the name of Livius Andronicus, under whose influence comedy *paulatim in artem verterat*, without further indication of date, while Horace's narrative (Epp. II

1, 156) marks the same stage by the words *Graecia capta . . . intulit artes*, which we have seen are to be referred to the same time as the beginnings of tragedy, viz. *post Punica bella*.

But while in Livy's account the mention of Livius Andronicus is without chronological clue, it affords us a form of expression which is important as confirming the theory of the situation which I have said must have confronted Accius in placing Livius so late. I have said above that the chronology of Accius must of necessity have created a period of dramatic history antecedent to 197, apparently without record, but concerning which a more or less definite tradition must have existed. Now, such a period is distinctly implied in the words *Livius qui ab saturis primus ausus est argumento fabulam serere* (VII 2, 8), for they do not say that Livius was the first to produce plays, but only that he was the first to inaugurate that change in structure of the comic plot which marks the beginning of the more artistic drama, the so-called *véa*.¹ Now, then, will any one believe that the words just quoted are from the same source as the sharp refutation of Accius' chronological error contained in the vigorous words of Varro: *consulibus Claudio Centhone et M. Sempronio Tuditano* (240 B. C.), *primus omnium L. Livius poeta fabulas docere Romae coepit* (Gellius, XVII 21, 42)? No, surely not. The two statements stand over against each other in marked and distinct antithesis, and are wholly irreconcilable. For while in the one, Livius Andronicus is given an organic place in the development of a native Roman comedy (a view which we have seen was the almost inevitable outcome of a false chronology), in the other he is designated with marked and unmistakable emphasis as the absolute beginner of dramatic performances at Rome. Whether the polemical note contained in the words *primus omnium* is merely directed against the view of Accius in general, or against some special assertion of it, it would be rash to affirm, in view of the meagreness of our sources; but it will at least make my position more clear to show that in fact it reads like a polemic against an utterance such as Livy has here preserved. For while Livy's account says that Livius Andronicus was the first to abandon satires and to compose plays with a general plot, it replies with sharp reproof of the error, that Livius Andronicus was the first of all to produce plays at Rome.

¹ Cf. Euanthius (Reif., p. 5): *coacti omittere satyram aliud genus carminis νέαν κωμῳδίαν . . . reperere poetae*.

We have now gained a point of view from which it is possible to explain without difficulty practically every problem that the accounts of Livy and Horace present. First of all the remarkable circumstance that Livius should be given a place in the organic development of Roman drama.¹ For placing the beginning of his career so late as Accius did, at a time before which for some forty years plays had been produced, it was the only possible relation that could be assigned to Livius; since it is not only inconceivable that Accius could have said of him that in the year 197 he was the first to produce a play, but the polemic of Varro reveals that he did not say it. Accordingly the tradition of Livius' absolute priority to all other poets Accius probably modified, as is done in Livy's account, so as to make Livius the inaugurator of the new form of comedy, the *néa*, to which all the known comedies of Roman writers belonged. Again, that the description is confined to the origins of comedy may be due to the fact that the dramatic tradition of the period before 197 was dominated by the memory of Naevius' boldness and freedom of speech, and this too, as before suggested, gave a point of analogy for the assumption of a Roman 'old comedy' of unrestrained jest (*solutio ioco*) and open attack (*aperta rabies*).

Our investigation has led us to results of considerable novelty, and they have assumed a definiteness, too, which it would seem impossible to attain on the basis of so meagre a record. But I think I make no arrogant claim in affirming that no step in the argument is without distinct support in our scant sources. That the results are surprising and almost incredible to us who have never considered anything else than the corrected Varronian chronology, will not seem strange; but if we put ourselves back into the extraordinary situation assumed by Accius all is very natural. To resume, therefore: the chronology of Accius, placing the beginning of the dramatic career of Livius Andronicus in 197 B. C., we have found was that probably familiar to Porcius Licinus at the beginning of the first century B. C., it was reproduced by Valerius Antias at about the same time, it was still the current view (though already corrected by Varro, but probably not long before this time) when Cicero wrote the Brutus (46 B. C.), the Tusculan Disputations (45 or 44) and the De senectute (44). It

¹ Cf. Leo, *Hermes*, XXIV (1889), p. 78: "Was hat Andronicus . . . mit volksmässigen Rudimenten römischen Bühnenspiels zu thun?"

appears in Livy, writing at about 15 B. C., in such a manner as to indicate that it was still no conspicuous error, and again in Horace's letter to Augustus of about the same date.

Now the first argument for our main contention is found here. The Accian chronology in this passage of Horace is inseparably connected with the preceding description of a native Roman comedy, while this description, as is universally conceded, is derived from the same source as Livy VII 2. That is, Horace's description is a piece of pre-Varronian literary history, and hence the chapter of Livy in question is also pre-Varronian. But this is not all, for in the second place Livy VII 2 bears independent evidence of pre-Varronian origin in the fact that it places Livius Andronicus in organic relation to the history of a comedy developed on Roman soil. Varro, on the contrary, by discovering the true chronological position of Livius and the recorded facts of Roman dramatic history, was able to affirm with great distinctness and emphasis that he had nothing to do with any earlier dramatic performances, that, indeed, there had never been a drama at Rome (*primus omnium*) before Livius Andronicus.

Thus with the downfall of the chronology of Accius, the whole structure of artificial literary history to which it had given rise fell. In consequence, in all subsequent allusions to the beginnings of Roman literature we find the scantiest trace of this pre-Varronian fiction, in spite of the fact that it carried the prestige of two such names as Livy and Horace. Livy himself had learned better (though he perhaps forgot it again in book thirty-six) when the progress of his narrative had brought him to the year 239, if it be true that Cassiodorus derived from Livy XX the following statement in his *Chronica* against that year: *his consularibus* (C. Manlius and Q. Valerius) *ludis Romanis primum tragoedia et comoedia a L. Livio ad scaenam data*. One other mention of the same fact will be instructive as showing the gulf that lay between the assumed knowledge which the descriptions of Livy and Horace reveal, and Varro's well-founded ignorance of any dramatic history prior to Livius Andronicus: *comoediam apud Graecos dubium est quis primus invenerit, apud Romanos certum: et comoediam et tragoediam [et togatam] primus Livius Andronicus repperit* (Donatus de comoedia, Reif., p. 8). But it is not necessary to review the frequent references subsequent to Livy's time to the corrected chronology of Varro. It will suffice to say that, with the exception of Valerius Maximus (II 4, 4),

who epitomized Livy's chapter without intelligence, of Euanthius (De com., p. 5, Reif.), who had from some good source a confused knowledge of the pre-Livian dramatic history, and a scholium of Porphyrio on the passage of Horace in question,¹ all record of it was swept away by Varro's investigations.²

We have thus seen that the two accounts which present us with the fiction of a Roman drama before Livius either reveal the chronology of Accius or else show distinct incompatibility with Varro's correction of it and with his statement of the position of Livius Andronicus in Roman dramatic history. It is therefore most natural and indeed almost necessary, as has been implied already, to refer the construction of this fictitious history to the same source as the false chronology which made it necessary. That is, to Accius; and I see nothing which stands in the way of such an assumption; nor is there, on the other hand, any figure in the pre-Varronian period to whom it can be referred with equal probability, nor any source from which it would more naturally have come than the Libri didascalicon; a brief consideration of which will afford an appropriate transition to the question of the Greek source which mediated between Aristotle and the one who first carried over the Aristotelian outline of the history of Greek comedy, as revealed in the descriptions of Livy and Horace.

To our knowledge of the Didascalica the investigations of the past few years have added a number of important items, so that the general character of the work (and of the related Pragmatica)

¹ For Euanthius, see my article above referred to, A. J. P. XV (1894), p. 13, and for Porphyrio, *ibid.*, p. 21. That Porphyrio has not stupidly attached a Greek explanation to the words of Horace, but understood them of a Roman *archaea comoedia*, is clear from his note on vs. 161, immediately afterward: *serius enim*] ratio cur Romanus non expoliverit pristina rudimenta.

² Our primary evidence for the history of satire (Diomedes, p. 485, with which Quintilian, X 1, 93 is in singular harmony) has not a word concerning a dramatic *satura* before Ennius, nor is the silence on this point due to the caprice of the epitomator, but to the deliberate rejection of a pre-Livian dramatic history such as Livy and Horace present. For in the same treatise De poematibus we have at p. 489 the emphatic statement of Varro's results: *constat apud illos (sc. Romanos) primum Latino sermone comoediam Livium Andronicum scripsisse*. How therefore, in the definition and sketch of satire, could we expect to find allusion made to a drama before Livius? The acceptance of Varro's results concerning the time and the position of Livius Andronicus was ipso facto rejection of any account which placed him in organic relation to a native Roman comedy.

is now discerned not obscurely.¹ The title was not interpreted narrowly by Accius, nor was the work confined within the limits which the analogy of Aristotle's *Διδασκαλῖαι* would suggest. The argument of the work was somewhat as follows. It began, I venture to believe, with a consideration of the different branches of poetry and their distinguishing characteristics, in regard to which a fragment assigned (as I suspect falsely) to the ninth book is preserved, containing also the dedication to Baebius: *nam quam varia sint genera poematorum, Baebi, quamque longe distincta alia ab aliis, sis, nosce*² (fr. 15, Baehrens). From this, transition was made to the epos and to Homer and Hesiod as the fountain-head of all poetry, so that the determination of their relative age may be thought of as having some historical (and not merely antiquarian) significance for the author's purpose, as fixing the ultimate source from which all forms of poetry were derived (fr. 7). But as the title indicates, the work was not a general survey of poetry and its forms (as Norden affirms), but a history of the drama and the stage, and the matter thus far reviewed was introductory to the special subject, of which there is unmistakable evidence of treatment in the first book (fr. 8).³ From the third book to the eighth there are no citations with designation of their place, but it is quite certain that after a

¹ Cf. especially Marx in Pauly's *Realencyc.*, ed. II, article Accius; Norden, *Varroniana*, Rh. Mus., vol. 48 (1893), p. 529 ff., where the significance of the title *Pragmatica* is explained (p. 531); Leo, *Plaut. Forsch.*, p. 32 (note).

² Charisius, p. 141, 34. The fragment is cited by Charisius with the formula *Accius quoque didascaliorum* VIII. I should guess that the error arose from a dittography of the three final characters of original *didascaliorum* I, in which *um* I was read a second time as VIII.

All analogies as well as ordinary expectation would assign this fragment to the beginning of the treatise. Cf., for example, Tzetzes' *περὶ διαφορῶς ποιητῶν* (Dübner, X b, p. xxiii), vs. 1 ff.: *ποιητικῶν μέλλονσιν ἄρχεσθαι λόγων* || *χρεὼν διδάσκειν πρῶτα τὰς διαίρεσεις*—words which indicate the practice as well as the principle of the arrangement of such treatises. That Tzetzes follows a tradition that dates from a period as early as the second century B. C. is shown by the exact agreement of the words which follow with our fragment of Accius: *ποιητικῶν (poematorum) γίνωσκε (nosce) σὺ (Baebi) γένος (genera) νέε* || *πόλλας τόμας φέρον (quam varia sint) τε καὶ διαίρεσεις (quamque longe distincta alia ab aliis)*. For the prefacing of a special treatise on dramatic poetry with an enumeration of the *genera poematorum*, cf. the Coislinian treatise *περὶ κωμωδίας* (Dübner, X d; Vahlen, *Arist. Poetics*, p. 79), which begins with a complete classification of poetry (vid. infra, p. 308).

³ I call attention to this because both Marx and Norden look upon the first book as devoted to epic poetry.

consideration of Greek dramatic poetry, to which the fragments of the second book refer, transition was made to Roman dramatic poetry, and to this part we must assign the chronological error in regard to the time of the first play of Livius (fr. 19), the discussion of the plays of Plautus *quae dicuntur ambiguae* (Gell. III 3, 1, fr. 20), and the allusion to the production of plays by Accius and Pacuvius in the same year, *cum ille octoginta, ipse triginta annos natus esset* (Brutus 229, fr. 21). The history of drama was followed by one or more books *de apparatu scaenico*, the single fragment from the eighth referring to the dress and equipment of actors. The ninth book may have continued the same subject, since, as I have said above, it is scarcely credible that at the end of the work the subject of the *genera poematorum* should have been taken up instead of at the beginning. Whether the orthographical principles of Accius were included in this work or not is uncertain; it is at least not impossible (cf. Norden, l. c., p. 536, note 3). In regard to the form of the work it is the opinion of Leo and Marx, following the observations of Bücheler (Rh. Mus., vol. 35, p. 401), that it was the Menippean combination of prose and verse, and the evidence, though slight, seems to warrant this conclusion. The date is uncertain. "Severioris doctrinae libros provectiore aetate composuisse Accium probabile est," says Müller (Lucil., p. 318), and Marx is able to fix the publication of the orthographical views of Accius at about 115 B. C., to which period he would also assign his other grammatical work (l. c., column 147 ad fin.).

The question of source is for our purpose more important. It is discussed briefly by Norden (l. c., p. 537), who says "pleraque fragmenta quasi digito ostendunt Aristophanem Byzantium," and he assumes that this is the general opinion of scholars. But he adduces no argument that goes beyond the assumption that there is no more probable source, *unde omnia perdisci ac percipi queuntur* (fr. 18),—a fragment in which Norden goes so far as to believe that Aristophanes is actually alluded to. But that is carrying speculation beyond legitimate limits in a manner that is by no means characteristic of the remainder of Norden's acute investigation. Marx is probably nearer the truth in stating that Accius was still chiefly under the influence of the Pergamene studies introduced by Crates, and he cites one positive bit of evidence of it that outweighs all of Norden's assumptions of probability. The miserable arguments by which Accius demon-

strated the seniority of Hesiod to Homer, I have quoted above (p. 286) in illustration of the trivial character of early Roman philological studies. That the opposite view was held by Aristarchus is pointed out by Marx, citing Aristonicus ad Il. XII 22, who gives reasons for the priority of Homer to Hesiod which are worthy to stand by the side of Accius' grounds for the opposite view, and which reveal that Accius probably derived not only his position in the question but also the arguments themselves from a Pergamene source. *À propos* of the mention of the rivers ὅσσοι ἀπ' Ἰδαίων ὀρέων ἄλαδε προρέουσι (Il. XII 19), the commentator writes: ὅτι ἀνέγνω Ἡσίοδος τὰ Ὀμήρου ὡς ἂν νεώτερος τούτου· οὐ γὰρ ἐξενήνοχε τοὺς ποταμοὺς μὴ ὄντας ἀξιολόγους, εἰ μὴ δι' Ὀμηρον, καὶ τῷ Σιμοῦντι προσέθηκεν ἐπίθετον τὸ θεῖον τε Σιμοῦντα (= Theogony 342; Lehrs, Aristarchus, p. 232 of the original edition). Leo, furthermore, recognizes in the fragment concerning the genuineness of certain Plautine plays the "sprachlich ästhetische Kritik, die nach pergamenischen Vorbild zu handhaben den römischen Dilettanten lockender erschien" (Plaut. Forsch., p. 33), and which was not combined with historical and chronological investigations of the Alexandrine type until Varro turned his attention to these studies.

To come at length to the question of the Greek source which afforded the Aristotelian outline of the history of comedy revealed in the descriptions of Livy and Horace, it may be assumed without further discussion that the Poetics of Aristotle was not used directly,¹ and we should naturally look for some more conventionalized Pergamene or Alexandrine source. In this matter I have said before that the twofold division of Attic comedy which both accounts display affords some clue, if Kaibel be right in identifying this division as Pergamene in distinction from the threefold Alexandrine classification. The circumstance that Accius is probably to be looked upon as a representative of the Pergamene school, as above pointed out, would cause us to look for a source in this direction, and there is no one to whom we should more naturally turn than to the master himself, Crates.

Our knowledge of the nature and the history of Greek comedy, aside from the material afforded by the monuments themselves, the brief testimony of Aristotle, and occasional allusions of other

¹Cf. Heitz, *Verlorene Schriften des Arist.*, p. 90, though of course I do not share his view concerning the fate of the esoteric writings. Cf. Zeller, *Phil. d. Gr.* II 2, p. 139 ff.

ancient writers, depends upon a series of treatises (for the most part anonymous) *περὶ κωμῳδίας*, which are most fully collected in Dübner's Scholia in Aristophanem. Other treatises of a similar character are enumerated by Consbruch,¹ who has been almost the only one to essay seriously the task of distinguishing the different elements and periods of grammatical studies which they contain. Several of these documents give as the source of their most valuable information Dionysius, Crates, Eucleides (Düb., pp. xix, 96), usually named together, so that we have but little assistance in separating the property of each. The identification of these names and the allotment of the different parts of the material adduced on their authority is naturally a matter of extreme difficulty and complexity. Consbruch has attempted it in a most painstaking study to which I have just alluded. His argument is far too technical and extensive to be even summarized here; but following it step by step, his conclusions have seemed to me sound and to merit the recognition which they have received.² He reaches the conclusion that of the three names above cited, Eucleides is the compiler of Dionysius and Crates and not an independent source. On the identity of the Dionysius in question, v. Consbruch, p. 225. In regard to Crates there has been general agreement that the Pergamene master is meant. To him, Consbruch concludes, must be assigned the divisions of comedy into its parts (in Tzetzae prolegomena in Aristoph. (Ritschl, Op.), p. 204 = Proleg. of the cod. Venetus of Aristophanes, Dübner, p. xxviii, note), and this in turn not only in respect to the division of comedy, but also in the division of τὸ γελοῖον (cf. Dübner, No. VI, p. xvi), is in complete agreement with the division in the valuable treatise e cod. Coisliniano, except that the latter is fuller on both subjects. He raises the question, therefore, whether this Coislinian treatise, in which, as Bernays has so shown convincingly, are contained important remains of Aristotelian teachings concerning comedy,³ is not to be ascribed to Crates, though not, of course, immediately. In addition to the points of identity with the portions of other treatises *περὶ κωμῳδίας* which must be assigned to Crates, this

¹ Zu den Tractaten *περὶ κωμῳδίας* in Comm. in honorem Guil. Studemund, Strassburg, 1889, p. 213 ff.

² Cf. Susemihl, Gesch. d. gr. Lit., vol. II, p. 11 (note 54).

³ Ergänzung zu Aristoteles Poetik. Originally in Rh. Mus., vol. VIII (1853), p. 561, now the second of Zwei Abhandlungen über die Aristotelische Theorie des Drama. Berlin, 1880.

treatise, as Consbruch observes, presents a number of features that either indicate Pergamene origin or at least marked divergence from the current Alexandrine sources of later antiquity. So, for instance, the division of poetry into *ποίησις ἀμίμητος* and *μιμητή* is radically at variance not only with Aristotle, but with Theophrastus and the general habit of later antiquity, fixed by the Alexandrine school, and yet it is on the whole so sensible and so obviously directed toward giving theoretical justification to didactic poetry like that of Empedocles, that we cannot imagine it an innovation of late date. This is, to be sure, but a negative indication of Pergamene origin, to which Consbruch adds one or two others, so that his suggestion that the Coislinian treatise represents a fuller form of the matter which in the others must be assigned to Crates gains in probability. But though differing from Aristotle in the general divisions of poetry, the treatise clearly represents throughout the Aristotelian theory of comedy with singular fidelity, and in marked contrast to other treatises of a like nature derived from stereotyped Alexandrine sources.

The closeness of adherence to Aristotle in the descriptions of Livy and Horace has already been alluded to, and I shall here repeat only two of the most striking points which illustrate a general principle of Aristotelian theory, viz. the condemnation of the old comedy of personal satire and the recognition of the superior art of the universal argument of the new comedy. In Poetics VI 3 but one name is mentioned in the history of old comedy, and that because it marked the transition to the new: Κράτης πρῶτος ἤρξεν ἀφόμενος τῆς λαμβικῆς ιδέας καθόλου ποιεῖν λόγους καὶ μύθους, of which *Livius primus ab saturis ausus est argumento fabulam serere* is practically a verbatim translation.¹ Similarly in Horace (Epp. II 1, 155), in the words *vertere modum—ad benedicendum delectandumque*, we have reproduced the Aristotelian deliberative definition of jest in comedy: ὀριστέον τῷ μὴ λυπεῖν τὸν ἀκούοντα ἢ καὶ τέρπειν; (Eth. IV 14, 7). It is contaminated here, however, with the conventional Alexandrine account of the cessation of the ἀρχαία κωμ. by reason of the laws forbidding the ὀνομαστὶ κωμῳδεῖν (*formidine fustis . . . redacti*, *ibid.*). The Aristotelian point of view is for the most part alien to the treatises

¹ On *satura* = λαμβικὴ ἰδέα, *argumento fabulam serere* = καθόλου ποιεῖν μύθους, v. 'Dramatic Satura,' etc., pp. 10-12 and notes. For the following cf. *ibid.*, pp. 24 and 25.

περὶ κωμῳδίας; which being derived from a school that esteemed the ἀρχαία as greatly as the νέα and which recognized its lasting significance and vitality, do not imply that it is an inferior form of art. In this respect the Coislinian treatise is in marked contrast to the others and, as was to be expected from its Aristotelian character, it contains the same censure of the old comedy that we have found in Aristotle. Thus in §4 (Bernays = Vahlen, p. 79) the distinction between the old and the new comedy is drawn with a partisan sharpness that reveals the hand of Aristotle (v. infra, p. 310). To the same tendency belong the words descriptive of the old and the new comedy at the end of the whole treatise: τῆς κωμῳδίας παλαιά, ἢ πλεονάζουσα τῷ γελοίῳ.¹ νέα, ἢ τοῦτο μὲν προειμένη, πρὸς δὲ τὸ σεμνὸν ῥέπουσα. The very close resemblance of this, not only in thought but also in expression, to the words of Livy's account in VII 2, 11 which characterize the *satura* and marked the transition to the more artistic drama of Livius [*ab risu ac soluto ioco* (πλεονάζουσα τῷ γελοίῳ) *res avocabatur* (τοῦτο μὲν προειμένη) *et ludus in artem* (πρὸς δὲ τὸ σεμνὸν) *paulatim verterat* (ῥέπουσα)], might not be urged too strongly as evidence of anything more than the same point of view, if it were not for the fact that in this same chapter we have a most unmistakable adaptation from the Poetics in the allusion to Livius Andronicus, and a similar reproduction of Aristotelian theory in Horace. We are therefore justified, I think, in suspecting that the *form* of Livy's description is derived from the same source as the schematic words of the Coislinian treatise. That the *thought* is Aristotelian does not require proof. Our identification of this portion of the Latin description as Aristotelian by comparison with a treatise of Pergamene origin suggests inevitably that the Aristotelian elements in Livy's and Horace's descriptions are derived from their ultimate source through a Pergamene medium—a conclusion which is in accord with what has been noted above concerning the probable source of the Didascalica of Accius.

There remains still one point to consider, and that is the designation of the assumed ἀρχαία κωμῳδία as *satura*. I have

¹ By these words is designated the abundance of the simple elements of physical laughter such as the λαιβορία and αἰσχρολογία of the old comedy would provoke. It is the *risu diducere rictum auditoris* of Horace, and for Aristotle as well as Horace this was not enough. A συμμετρία . . . τοῦ γελοίου ἐν ταῖς κωμῳδαῖς (π. κωμ. Coisl., §6) was necessary:—"Wie in der Tragödie ein Ebenmass von φόβος zu ἔλεος verlangt wurde, so muss die Komödie ein Ebenmass von γέλως zu τέρψις haben" (Bernays, p. 151).

shown before that the well-known parallelism assumed by Roman critics between Lucilius and the old comedy (Horace, Serm. I 4) illustrates the possibility and the applicability of this designation, and perhaps it is a sufficient explanation to say that in the interest of clearness it was desirable to choose a designation which should be descriptive, rather than such a term as *vetus* or *antiqua comoedia*, which would have been subject to misinterpretation as referring only to a time distinction. But the true reason probably lay deeper and is to be looked for in the Greek source from which the description is drawn. It is doubtless well known that in the Poetics Aristotle distinctly disavows for the drama of Cratinus, Eupolis and Aristophanes the designation of *κωμῳδία* in an ideal sense—I mean in such a manner as *τραγῳδία* is used by him for the drama of Aeschylus and Sophocles. So, for example, those writers are excluded from the domain of true comedy in the words τὰ τῆς κωμῳδίας σχήματα πρῶτος ("Ὀμηρος) ὑπέδειξεν, οὐ ψόγον ἀλλὰ τὸ γελοῖον δραματοποιήσας (IV 9). Again, in outlining the development of comedy he alludes to the *ἀρχαία* as the *λαμβικὴ ἰδέα*, the lampooning form of comedy—that is, the lampooning stage in the slow development of real comedy—which even in his own time he did not look upon as having attained its perfect form like tragedy, "which after passing through many changes stopped when it had arrived at its true nature" (IV 12). It is, perhaps, therefore not an accident of our meagre record that has withheld from us a definition of comedy from the hand of Aristotle; for while he was prepared to indicate the course that true comedy must take and was taking, he was not prepared to define it in its imperfect form. Most instructive, from this point of view, is the illustration of the universal in poetry in IX 5: "In comedy this is now apparent; for the poets put together their plots from the standpoint of probability and assume any names for their characters whatsoever, and not as the lampooners (*λαμποποιοί*) who write concerning a particular person." Now, in the Coislinian treatise *περὶ κωμῳδίας* the same point of view is given utterance to with even greater emphasis than in the Poetics, and there we find true comedy set over against the abusiveness that had formerly passed for comedy in a striking manner (§4, Bernays): Διαφέρει ἡ κωμῳδία (i. e. true comedy) τῆς λοιδορίας (i. e. the *ἀρχαία κωμ.*), while the same point of view is revealed in the division of comedy into periods at the end of the whole treatise (v. supra, p. 309).

Looked at in this light, we shall be justified in suspecting that it is not a mere accident, that in the account of Livy the period

corresponding to the old comedy is marked by the descriptive designation *satura* and not by the word *comoedia*. The literary historian, following the Aristotelian model, avoided the latter word and chose an expression that should characterize it unmistakably as *λοιδορία*, *maledicentia*, and found for this no more fitting Latin word than *satura*, the native Roman type of the *carmen maledicum* (Diomedes, from an early source). And just as Aristotle designates the writers of the old comedy as *ιαμβοποιοί*, so we find Lucilius placed in the same category in Diomedes, p. 485 (Suetonius, Reif., p. 19): *iambus est carmen maledicum . . . appellatum . . . παρὰ τὸ ἱαμβίζειν, quod est maledicere* (cf. Proclus ap. Reif., l. c., τὸ ἱαμβίζειν κατὰ τινα γλῶσσαν λοιδορεῖν ἔλεγον): *cuius carminis praecipui scriptores . . . apud Romanos Lucilius et Catullus* etc.¹ We need not therefore assume that the theory of Lucilius as the Roman representative of the old comedy had already been developed: it was sufficient that his poems should have been recognized as a typical form of *λοιδορία*. And who had better reason to realize this than Accius, (*cuius*) *in poematis obtrectandis clarior Lucilius fuit* (Gell. XVII 21, 49)?

In conclusion, to bring together in brief summary the lines of the foregoing argument, I have aimed to prove first of all that the chapter of Roman literary history under discussion is pre-Varronian, and is to be attributed most naturally to Accius. In what has been presented concerning the Greek source which mediated between Aristotle and Accius, I have desired to indicate the most probable line of connection, in a case where certainty is unattainable. The remarks on the appropriateness of giving to an assumed 'old comedy' a descriptive designation such as the name *satura* affords will, I hope, carry conviction, and serve to confirm the correctness of the view which I have advanced by furnishing another element of close analogy to Aristotelian theory.

G. L. HENDRICKSON.

¹ The fact that Lucilius is reckoned among the Roman iambic writers as well as among the satirists may perhaps indicate two sources or periods of literary criticism. The association of his name with the writers of the old comedy is certainly as old as Varro or, as I suspect, older. An earlier view may not have gone further than to make him an *ιαμβοποιός*, rather from tone and spirit than as an author of iambic verses, which, to be sure, he wrote. Might the transference of the name of his composition to an assumed Roman ἀρχαία κωμ. have given rise to the notion of his dependence on the old comedy?

NOTES.

CATO'S FINAL *m*: A NOTE TO QUINT. INST. OR. I 7, 23;
IX 4, 39.

I 7, 23 quid? non Cato Censorius dica *m* et facia *m* dicae et faciae scripsit eundemque in ceteris, quae similiter cadunt, modum tenuit? quod et ex veteribus eius libris manifestum est et a Messala in libro de *s* littera positum.

IX 4, 39 . . . et illa Censori Catonis dicae faciaeque *m* littera in *e* mollita.

Unfortunately, the text in both passages is corrupt at the important point. In the first the Codex Ambros. (A) gives *dice et face*, Codex Par. Nostrad. (N) *dice et facie*, which Halm adopted in his edition, while both Bonnell and Meister print *dicem et faciem*, evidently believing that Quintilian is here speaking of a weakening of final *-am* to *-em*. That this assumption is incorrect is shown by the words *et a Messala in libro de s littera positum*. In his book on the letter *s* Messala discussed the weakened final *s* (Quint. IX 4, 38)—so far as our knowledge goes he did not touch the question of weakened final syllables—and therefore, whatever he said on the subject of the letter *m* was probably confined to *m* final. This helps establish *dicae et faciae*, the reading of the two oldest manuscripts, Codex Bernensis (Bn.) and Codex Bambergensis (Bg.), both of the tenth century, as the correct manuscript tradition, and I have therefore, with Gertz, adopted it in the text above. In the second passage our best authorities are the Codex Ambrosianus and the second hand of the Bambergensis, both of which show *dicae hac eque*; Gertz, however (Emendat. Quintil. in Opusc. philol. ad Madvigium missa. Havniae, 1876), restored the correct reading from the first book.

The first passage has not been generally understood, but, so far as I know, the passage from the ninth book has been taken at its face value, and the statement that Cato used an *e* to represent the

sound of final *m* is generally accepted. (So Bennett, Appendix, p. 17; Lindsay, Latin Language, p. 61; Seelman, Aussprache des Lateins, p. 362.) Yet a little reflection will raise a question as to the correctness of Quintilian's statement. Certainly the letter *e* can never have properly represented an obscured or diminished *m* (Quint., l. c., §40 neque enim eximitur [sc. *m* littera] sed obscuratur), and Cato would have preferred the common device of dropping the final *m* to the use of so arbitrary a symbol as *e*. We are justified, in fact, on *à priori* grounds in believing that Cato used some sign nearer the letter *m* itself to express the obscured nasal. I venture then to conjecture that Cato wrote, not *e*, but *M* turned on its side, Σ , placed either after or over the vowel. That this symbol in the free hand of the copyist should have been confused with *E* is not strange, and Quintilian's statement (l. c., §39), quae in veteribus libris reperta mutare imperiti solent, et dum librariorum insectari volunt inscientiam, suam confitentur, shows the natural consequence of this misunderstanding. If my conjecture be correct, the words *m littera* and *e mollita* must be regarded as an early gloss which under the circumstances easily made its way into the text, unless, indeed, we wish to believe that Quintilian himself did not understand Cato's device.

Yet this conjecture, based simply on *à priori* reasoning, would have little value; it is possible, however, to give it a high degree of probability from the analogy of other similar devices. It is well known that in Augustus' time Verrius Flaccus used half the letter to represent the faint sound of final *m* (Velius Longus, KGL. VII 80, 17-20 set Flaccus, ut . . . *m* non tota, sed pars illius prior tantum scriberetur, ut appareret exprimere non debere). Furthermore, the common abbreviation in manuscripts, a stroke over the vowel, \bar{a} , was in all probability originally an abbreviated *m*, as is shown by the parallel forms \bar{a} , \bar{a} , \bar{a} ; and finally my conjecture receives strong support from the usage in certain Lango-bard manuscripts, e. g. $\overset{3}{r}e$ *rem*, $\overset{3}{a}$ *am*, etc. (cf. Wattenbach, Anleitung zur lat. Palaeographie⁴, p. 70). The abbreviation 3, which from the fourteenth century is used to represent final *m*, is probably a general abbreviation and cannot be regarded as a form of *m*. But the analogies I have mentioned give sufficient support to my conjecture, which, I believe, throws some light on two awkward passages.

CLIFFORD HERSCHEL MOORE.

THE ATHENIAN SECRETARIES.

A Confirmation.

In §13 of a treatise on the Athenian Secretaries, published last April as No. VII of the Cornell Studies in Classical Philology, I endeavored to show that during the two hundred years following 304/3 B. C., as in the thirty years preceding 322/1 B. C., the Prytany Secretaries followed one another in the official order of their tribes. Wherever the sequence of the tribes of a group of secretaries was known, that sequence was found to be the official order, and four cases were instanced, in which the year fixed for the archon by the official order of the secretaries' tribes coincided with the year which had to be ascribed to the archon for other reasons. At that time, these four archons were the only ones after 299/8 B. C. whose colleagues in the secretaryship we knew, and whose exact year could be determined. Now two others can be added to the list.

1) Dionysius of Halicarnassus¹ fixes the archon Nikostratos in the year 295/4 B. C., and his testimony is almost universally² accepted by the many scholars who in recent times have investigated the chronology of this period. According to my canon the tribe Aiantis³ should have furnished the secretary for 295/4 B. C., and, through the kindness of Dr. A. Wilhelm, I am now able to state that an unpublished inscription of Nikostratos' year shows the secretary to have belonged to the deme Phaleron, of the tribe postulated. Hence it is seen that the troublous times of Lachares' tyranny did not disturb the official order.

2) A *senatus consultum*⁴ found recently at Delphi, and to be published in an early number of the Bull. de Corr. Hell., is dated precisely, in the year 112 B. C., by the names of the Roman consuls, L. Calpurnius (Piso) and M. Livius (Drusus).⁵ Fortunately, the translation of this document into Greek was made by

¹ De Dinarcho, 9.

² Schubert, R. (Hermes, X (1876), p. 447 ff.), thought that the archon for the year 301/0 B. C. was wanting in Dionysius' list, and, consequently, that Nikostratos belonged to 294/3 B. C., but Ladek, Fr. (Wiener Studien, XIII (1891), p. 117), has shown that this is impossible.

³ Cornell Studies in Class. Phil. VII (1898), p. 50.

⁴ Bull. de Corr. Hell. XXI (1897-98), p. 583 ff. and p. 600.

⁵ Mommsen, CIL. 19 p. 535.

the Athenian treasurer at Delphi, who, in order to date the decree from the Attic standpoint, added to the names of the Roman consuls that of Dionysios, the Athenian archon for the same year. On the basis of the official order, Dionysios had already been assigned by me to 112/1 B. C.¹; for the secretary for Dionysios' year belonged to the tribe Aiantis,² and Aiantis was the tribe demanded for 112/1 B. C. by the official order, if it continued unbroken from 304/3 B. C. on. That it did so continue seems to me to be proved, now that we know that Dionysios was archon in 112/1 B. C.

CORNELL UNIV., ITHACA, N. Y.,
Nov. 16, 1898.

W. S. FERGUSON.

PINDAR, NEMEAN III 62.

This is a passage that has raised abundant controversy. No one, however, so far as I am aware, has yet observed (1) that one of the scholiasts had before him a reading materially differing from any of the *textus recepti*, and (2) that the scholiast's reading, which removes all difficulty from the passage, can be restored by the alteration of a single letter.

Omitting stops (as to which editors differ), the current reading is:

“καὶ ἐγχεσφόροις ἐπιμίξαις
Αἰθιόπεσσι χεῖρας ἐν φρασὶ πάξαιθ' ὅπως σφίσι μὴ κοῖρανός ὀπίσω
πάλιν οἴκαδ' ἀνεψιὸς ζαμενῆς Ἑλένοιο Μέμνων μῶλοι.”

Some take χεῖρας ἐν φρασὶ πάξαιθ' together, in a physical sense: others take ἐν φρασὶ πάξαιθ' in a mental sense, and associate χεῖρας with ἐπιμίξαις. Bergk emends πάξαιθ' ὅπως into πάξαι θάπος. But the concluding words of the scholium that is numbered 3 in Prof. Bury's edition run thus: “ἀντὶ τοῦ εἰς πέρας ἄγοι.” It is, I think, obvious that, instead of χεῖρας, this scholiast read πείρας, a Pindaric form occurring in the 2d Olympian, and equivalent to πείραρ or πέρας.

This rare form would, in the context, be most easily corrupted into χεῖρας.

I therefore have no hesitation in restoring πείρας and translating: “And that, having come hand to hand with the Ethiop spearmen,

¹ Cornell Studies, VII, p. 58.

² CIA. II 475.

he might fix his heart on the execution of this intent—namely, that their chief should never return," etc.

This reading and rendering is made certain by the earlier half of the above-mentioned scholium, viz. "παγίως (MS πλαγίως) λογίσαιτο καὶ κρίνοι," i. e. "might firmly determine and also bring his determination to execution," which is an admirable paraphrase of the condensed expression "πεῖρας ἐν φρασὶ πάξαιθ'."

Does not the emendation I suggest also give to ὅπως a more idiomatic significance?

R. J. WALKER.

REVIEWS AND BOOK NOTICES.

P. Papinii Statii Silvarum Libri herausgegeben und erklärt von
FRIEDRICH VOLLMER. Leipzig, Druck und Verlag von
B. G. Teubner, 1898. xvi+598 pp. Preis geh. M. 16.

A welcome addition to the resources of the student of Roman literature is Vollmer's edition of Statius' *Silvae*. A good commentary has long been needed for this work, crowded as it is with allusions to ancient localities, buildings and works of art, and to the customs of Roman public and private life. The progress of knowledge in archaeology has been so rapid since the days of Markland and Lemaire that it was worth while to apply the results of more than half a century of research to the elucidation of these interesting poems. This Vollmer has done and much besides. The book, dedicated to Professor Franz Buecheler on the completion of twenty-five years' academic work at Bonn, contains an introduction (pp. 1-52), text with critical apparatus, *auctores*, *imitatores* and *testimonia* (pp. 55-202), commentary (pp. 204-554), appendix treating prosody and metre (pp. 555-60), and indices (pp. 561-98), the latter comprising an index of proper names and an index to the introduction and commentary compiled by H. Saftien. Following the preface are seven closely printed pages of *addenda et corrigenda*.

In the first part of the introduction the time of composition of the individual poems, the dates of publication of the different books, and the life and character of the poet are discussed. Vollmer thinks (p. 11 f.) that while the poems of the first three books were written between 90 and 94, these books were published almost at the same time (93/94), after the completion of the *Thebais* (92/93), the publication of which cannot, in his opinion, be more definitely fixed than some time before 95. But H. Nohl¹ and R. Helm² seem to have good ground for their contention when they argue from *Theb. I 19 bis adactum legibus Histrum*, and *Martial, IX 101, 17* (dated 94) *cornua Sarmatici ter perfida contudit Histri*, that the *Thebais* was published before the Sarmatian war of 92. Support for this view is found in the difference of tone between *praef. I adhuc pro Thebaide mea, quamuis me reliquerit, timeo* and *Silv. IV 4, 87 f., ib. 7, 27 f.*, written in the summer of 95. All the time from 92 to 95 is required to account

¹ *Quaestiones Statianae*, p. 23 f.

² *De P. Papinii Statii Thebaide*, p. 157.

for so great a change. The similarity of the prefaces to bks. I, II and III proves nothing, while the separation of II 2 and III 1, both addressed to Pollius Felix, militates strongly against Vollmer's theory. Is it not possible, too, that Vollmer has wrongly interpreted the passage in praef. IV *reor equidem aliter quam inuocato numine maximi imperatoris nullum opusculum meum coepisse*? Understanding *opusculum* as a whole book, he argues that the statement is true of the Thebais, *Silvae* bks. I-III, bk. IV, and the Achilleis, not of bks. II and III alone. But Statius regularly uses *opusculum*, as he does *ecloga* and *libellus*, to refer to single poems, and there seems to be no good reason for thus forcing its meaning in this case. He has never begun any poem without invoking, mentally if not in verse, the divine assistance of the Emperor as his inspiring muse. Compare praef. II, l. 3 and praef. IV, l. 22; Pliny, Epist. VIII 21, 4; Archiv f. lat. Lex. u. Gram. VI 247, 252 f. The evidence seems to point to the publication of the Thebais in 92 or the end of 91, shortly before the appearance of *Silvae*, bk. I in 92. Bks. II and III were sent forth separately in 93/94.—With good reason Vollmer (p. 19) rejects the view, accepted for example by M. Schanz,¹ that Statius left Rome on account of the *repulsa Capitolina*. This failure and the Alban success are rightly placed in the year 90; the poet's ill-health sufficiently accounts for his change of residence. In his estimate of Statius as man and courtier (p. 21), the editor takes a more favorable view than, for instance, Macaulay or Teuffel, and apologizes for his flattery of the Emperor, which after all, when compared with Martial's, seems not so excessive.

Of the valuable chapter on the *Würdigung und Geschichte der Silvae* little need be said. Besides a discussion of the name *silva* and the type of literature to which these poems belong, their popularity and treatment at the hands of scholars up to our own time are traced in clear outlines. On p. 29 the editor has perhaps made too much of the phrases given by Kerckhoff as common-places in Statius. Many of them occur only twice and some are just as characteristic of other authors. A carefully written account of the manuscripts follows from the pen of Moritz Krohn, from whom we may expect soon to receive a critical edition of the *Silvae* in the Teubner series. The brief appendix on the wars of Domitian, though prepared without the assistance of Gsell's valuable book, *Essai sur le règne de l'empereur Domitien*, Paris, 1893, will yet prove useful. To prevent a possible misunderstanding on p. 48, n. 6, I would suggest the addition of the cross-reference Vgl. S. 49, Anm. 9.

In his constitution of the text Vollmer has wisely revolted from the subjective methods which have played too large a part in the criticism of the *Silvae*, and is generally guided by the more conservative principles which he professes on p. v. Apart from

¹ *Geschichte der römischen Litteratur*, I 2, 311.

the fact that he has rejected a host of unnecessary emendations, he marks a distinct advance over his predecessors. In the readings noted by Angelo Poliziano on the margin of the *editio princeps* now in the Corsini library at Rome, Vollmer has carefully distinguished between those expressly attributed to the *codex Sangallensis* found by Poggio (A*) and those whose source is not directly stated (A). The former class only he considers as the record of the best tradition; the overestimation of the latter was a notable weakness in the edition of Baehrens. A comparison of A*—which, unfortunately, includes only eighty readings—with the extant fifteenth-century manuscripts reveals the fact that the *Matritensis*, agreeing in all but six, stands nearest the lost *codex Sangallensis*. In view of this it is not the least merit of the present editor to have been the first to bring the readings of this manuscript to bear upon the text of the *Silvae*.¹ From the complete collation placed at Vollmer's disposal by M. Krohn, only the most important readings are printed.

The commentary is an excellent piece of work and will win the commendation of all students of Statius. Especially valuable are the carefully prepared analyses, which often throw light on the rhetorical structure of the poems and show how far Statius was under the influence of the schools. The editor has endeavored to sustain the happy mean between diffuseness and excessive brevity, and has on the whole succeeded. In many passages where readings hitherto rejected must be defended, long discussions are necessary, but are seldom unduly prolonged. A close comparison with the commentaries of Markland and Lemaire shows the value and importance of the new edition. A few of the readings and interpretations may be briefly noticed. The comment to praef. I, l. 2 (p. 209), reads: "*hos libellos* die einzelnen Gedichte (wie Horaz S. I 10, 92)." While there is no doubt that this is the usage for Statius, our editor will find few scholars to agree with him for this passage of Horace.—On p. 218 we find a new interpretation of I 1, 17 f. Vollmer understands the words *par forma decorque, par honor* to refer to the horse: "seine Grösse und Schönheit entspricht der Ehre, dass es den Kaiser trägt." But this seems to miss the close connection between *maiora* and *par*. If *veris maiora* refers to the comparison with the wooden horse, as he assumes, the meaning should be: 'This horse is as shapely and graceful as the wooden horse.' I would refer *maiora* to the immediately preceding clause and interpret: 'And do not think this statue exceeds the truth: the Emperor himself is just as beautiful and glorious.'—In the oft-emended and much-explained passage I 1, 27 f. our editor, after referring to Hand's edition of 1817 for older attempts,

¹ A. Klotz gives readings of M for *Silv.* II 2, and A. Herzog for I 2; cf. *Curae Statianae*, 1896, p. 9, and *Stati Epithalamium*, 1881.

gives nine more recent emendations, and finally accepts the explanation of the manuscript reading long ago offered by Domizio Calderino. He certainly ought to have mentioned in this connection Macnaghten's¹ ingenious and probably correct defence of the transmitted text, which takes *castris* as the *Castra Cornelia* described by Caesar, *Bell. Civ.* II 24.—On p. 222 to l. 34 a cross-reference to IV 2, 18 f. would be helpful.—I cannot agree with Vollmer that emendation is necessary in I 1, 65 (p. 226). While *linguit* is open to no objection on palaeographical grounds, *fingit*, which makes equally good sense, should in my opinion be retained and interpreted with Burmann.—The emendation of I 2, 122 *queritur* to *queritor* is an improvement on the *querimur* of Peyraredus and is doubtless right. Not only is the intensive verb well suited to the character of Venus, as Vollmer explains in the *Rhein. Mus.* LI (1896), p. 35, but the first person singular brings it into agreement with the preceding *dederim* and the following *iussi*.—It is hard to believe that the definite reference to time in *Silvae*, V 3, 29 is a mere fiction (pp. 526 and 9, n. 10), and it is most improbable that after a lapse of years Statius could have had any reason for thus antedating his poem, especially a poem of this character. The view of Klotz (*Curae Statianae*, 1896, p. 61) and Friedländer (*Sittengeschichte*, III⁶, p. 479) seems to be more reasonable.

The influence of earlier authors on Statius and of Statius on later writers is discussed briefly in the introduction, and parallel passages are quoted in their proper place beneath the text. To be sure, this list of *auctores et imitatores* could have been much enlarged. Add, for example, to I 1, 8 Martial, III 95, 7 notumque per oppida nomen; to II 6, 53 Plaut. *Amph.* 960 voltum e voltu comparat; to III 3, 201 Iuv. II 6, Mart. I 109, 19, and IX 101, 1; to IV 6, 39 Mart. II 75, 9, X 31, 5, Iuv. VIII 29, Sen. *Quaest. Nat.* III, pr. §3, *Epist.* VII 2 (64), §4, *Benef.* II 11, 1; to V 2, 10 f. Hor. *Sat.* I 5, 43. Many passages, too, which are mentioned in the commentary might have been included, e. g. to I 3, 26 Hor. *Sat.* II 3, 53 f. For imitations in Apollinaris Sidonius the monograph of R. Bitschofsky² would have been serviceable, while that of H. de la Ville de Mirmont³ would have given a number of echoes in the *Mosella* of Ausonius not here noted. Interesting as it would be to see the influence of Statius on mediaeval and modern literature fully treated, that subject does not properly lie within the scope of an edition. As far as English authors are concerned, until the present century few ancient poets were more popular than he; but the reminiscences, quotations and translations are, if my memory serves me, almost entirely from his epic poems.

¹ *Journal of Philology*, XIX (1891), p. 129.

² De C. Sollii Apollinaris Sidonii studiis Statianis, Vindob. 1881.

³ De Ausonii *Mosella*, Paris, 1892.

The bibliographical lists (pp. 1, 204-6) form a valuable addition to the book, but it is to be regretted that they are not made complete for the more recent literature of the subject. Here and on p. 237 I miss the monographs on L. Arruntius Stella, Doelling, Einige Notizen über den Dichter Stella aus Patavium, Plauen, 1840, and P. Rasi, De L. Arruntio Stella, poeta Patavino, Padua, 1890. The following also might with advantage have been added: R. Bitschowsky, Neue Jahrb. f. Phil. u. Paed. 121 (1880), p. 499 f.; id., Wien. Stud. III (1881) 159; id., De C. Sollii Apollinaris Sidonii studiis Statianis, Vindob. 1881; H. Blass, Rhein. Mus. XXX (1875), pp. 458-63; O. A. Danielsson, Eranos, II (1897), p. 43 f.; R. Ellis, Jour. of Phil. XV (1886), p. 3 f.; id., ib. XX (1892), pp. 17-24; G. Lafaye, Revue de Phil. XX (1896), pp. 53-6; Th. Mommsen, Korr.-Bl. d. westd. Zeitschrift, V 216; O. Müller, Rhein. Mus. XVIII (1863), p. 200; H. Nissen, Rhein. Mus. XL (1885), p. 358 f.; cf. A. Mommsen, Burs. Jahresb. LXIX (1891), pp. 140 f., 143; K. Rossberg, Neue Jahrb. f. Phil. u. Paed. 123 (1881), pp. 143-4; Fr. Skutsch, Wien. Stud. XVII (1895), p. 160; J. Vahlen, Ind. lect. Berl. 1895-96; C. Wachsmuth, Rhein. Mus. XXIX (1874), p. 355 f.; A. Riese, Rhein. Mus. LI (1896), p. 637 f.; A. Klotz, Phil.-hist. Beiträge f. Wachsmuth (1897), p. 167 f.; F. Lohr, De infinitivi apud Statium et Iuvenalem usu, Marb. 1876; P. J. Oesterberg, De structura verborum c. praep. comp. ap. Val. Flaccum, Statium, Martialem, Holmiae, 1883; A. Zingerle, Zu späteren lateinischen Dichtern, I, II, Innsbruck, 1873, 1879. A few of these monographs are referred to in the introduction or commentary, as, e. g., A. Zingerle on p. 30, n. 10. Such scattered references might have been collected and others not mentioned anywhere in the book might have been added; for the usefulness of a bibliography increases in proportion to its completeness, especially for the more recent contributions to the subject.

That the printing of the introduction and text in 1895 and the commentary in 1897/8 would cause damage to the work as a whole, was doubtless foreseen by the editor, who in his later preface apologizes for the lack of harmony and asks that in some passages the text be corrected by the commentary. An example will illustrate the conditions to which I refer. The text of Praef. I, l. 13 is *quamvis timeo ne* with the critical note *quamvis mimeone; corr. s.* In the commentary (p. 211) we find: "Durch ein ärgerliches Versehen ist im Apparate *quamvis mimeo* als Ueberlieferung stehen geblieben, während M¹ hat *quam meone* und erst M², dem die jüngeren Handschriften folgen, an den Rand schrieb *quis*. St. kann also ebensogut *quamquam* geschrieben haben; eine der verzeichneten Ausonstellen empfiehlt sogar diese Annahme." Turning to the *addenda et corrigenda* (p. x) we read: "Meine Angabe im Apparate, die Ueberlieferung sei *quamvis mimeone* war doch gut begründet. . . . Wahrscheinlich ist *qua* in M¹ Schreibfehler für *quis*, also *quamvis* für überliefert zu

halten." The recurrence of such cases is unpleasant, to say the least, and must be as annoying to the editor himself as it is troublesome to his readers.

In conclusion one blemish must be pointed out, a serious blemish in any book, but especially in one where exactness is of such importance. I refer to the large number of errors and inaccuracies in reference, quotation and the like, some of them of little consequence, others quite misleading. An inaccurate reference or quotation may seem a matter of slight moment, providing it does not cause serious difficulty or misunderstanding, and any one who has seen even a few pages through the press knows how difficult it is to avoid some slips of this sort. But the presence of errors in such large numbers—if the whole book may be judged by the few pages which I have tested from this point of view—lessens confidence and distinctly detracts from the scientific value of the work. Let me give some of the examples which I have noticed, including a few which are merely typographical: p. ix, addend. to p. 30, read *Hor. A. P. 47 . . . iunctura nouum*, and in *A. P. 52* for *seu* read *si*; p. x, addend. to p. 30, read *III 5, 73*; p. 1, for *Ruedeger, 1888*, read *Ruediger, 1887*, so p. 422, l. 23, but correct on p. 213, l. 7; p. 6, n. 7, read *v. 6 post patrii laetum*; p. 7, n. 10, read *v. 142/3*; p. 8, n. 5 fin., for *Anm. 6* read *Anm. 3*; p. 9, with l. 10, *ediert Sommer 94*, compare l. 21, *ediert Mitte oder Ende 94*; p. 9, n. 7, read *quos Saturnalibus una risimus*; p. 11, n. 4, l. 3, for *idem* read *iam*; p. 14, n. 3, l. 1, read *IV 2, 66 f.*; p. 16, n. 6, read *S. III 5, 13*; p. 23, l. 4 from end, read *vita Vaccae Lucans*, and for *adversus* read *adversum*; p. 29, n. 1, l. 8, read *134 celsusque*; p. 31, l. 14, read *zu*; p. 36, n. 2, l. 7, for *Gevartii succidanea* read *Crucei succidanea*; p. 39, n. 1, read *Additional Manuscripts*; p. 48, n. 6, for *3. Sept. 84 imp. V* read *3. Sept. 84 imp. VII¹*; p. 51, n. 6 fin., read *Marcellinus IX 45*; p. 52, n. 2, l. 1, read *III 3, 171*, and *ib.*, l. 5, for *improbus* read *improbo*. The bibliographical list, too, is not free from errors, especially in dates: p. 204, middle, Henry's article appeared in *Neue Jahrb. f. klass. Phil.* 93 (1866), 642 ff.; *ib.*, l. 9 from end, Madvig has two articles on the *Silvae* in *Adversaria Critica*, viz. I 149 to *Silv. II 6, 64* and II 157 ff. to more than a dozen other passages; Vollmer has combined the two in the following unhappy manner: *N Madvig adversaria critica II (1873) 152 ff. zu II 6, 64*; p. 205, l. 13, *M Haupt Hermes XIII 180* is a false entry for *Hermes, VIII (1874) 180 f.*, which is in its right place on the preceding page; *ib.*, l. 14, Köstlin's article in *Phil. XXXVIII (1879) 40 f.* is occupied chiefly with other poets, touching Statius only in the discussion of two passages of the *Thebais*, p. 61 f.; *ib.*, l. 25, R. Ellis wrote on some passages of the *Silvae* in the *Journal of Philology*, XIII (1885), pp. 88–97, not (1882) 91; *ib.*, l. 27, for 1883 read 1878; *ib.*, l. 10 from end, read *Journ. of Philol. XIX*

¹ Cf. *Ephem. Epig.* V 93.

(1891) 129 ff.; ib., l. 4 from end, read *Hermes*, XXV (1890); p. 206, l. 11, read *Hermes*, XXVIII (1893); ib., l. 14, read *F. Vollmer*, *Textkritisches zu Statius*, *Rhein. Mus.* LI (1896) 27 ff., not 25 ff. In the commentary I have noted the following: p. 210, l. 1, for *nach V 5, 78* read *nach V 5, 84*; p. 218 to v. 18, p. 224 to v. 48, and other places where reference is made to the sixth book of the Thebais, the numbering of Kohlmann would have been more acceptable; p. 223 fin., II 2, 113 reads *uoluit*, not *euoluit*, as you would suppose; p. 225, l. 6 from end, read III 2, III and insert *limina* after *Phoebea*; p. 226, l. 8, read *62 f.*, 233, and ib., l. 21, read III 1, 117; p. 228 to v. 85, l. 2, for *principem* read *Caesarem*; p. 453 to v. 17, l. 5, for *sine ullo* read *sine ulla*. Perhaps the most serious error I have observed in the commentary is on p. 219 to v. 22, where we are told that the temple of Divus Iulius was "dediciert von Augustus am 10. Aug. 27." Of course, the correct date is Aug. 18, 725/29: cf. C. I. L. I³, p. 325; Mommsen, *Res Gest. Div. Aug.*, p. 80; Hülsen, *Nom. Topog.*, p. 81.

In spite of its defects, however, this edition is a mine of information and a boon to the student not of Statius only, but of the poets of that period, and will go far toward re-awakening interest in an author who until our own century was one of the most popular of ancient writers.

JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY.

HARRY LANGFORD WILSON.

ANGLO-SAXON DICTIONARIES.

An Anglo-Saxon Dictionary, based on the Manuscript Collections of the late JOSEPH BOSWORTH, D. D., F. R. S. Edited and enlarged by T. NORTHCOTE TOLLER, M. A., Smith Professor of English in the Owens College, Manchester. Part IV, Section II. *Swið-snel-Ýtmest*. Oxford, At the Clarendon Press, 1898.

A Concise Anglo-Saxon Dictionary for the Use of Students. By JOHN R. CLARK HALL, M. A., Ph. D. London, Swan Sonnenschein & Co.; New York, Macmillan & Co., 1894.

The Student's Dictionary of Anglo-Saxon. By HENRY SWEET, M. A., Ph. D., LL. D. New York, The Macmillan Company; London, Macmillan & Co., Ltd., 1897.

After the lapse of fifteen years since the publication of Parts I and II of the Bosworth-Toller Anglo-Saxon Dictionary, we now have it completed with the issue of Part IV, Section 2. But, as

dictionaries are seldom completed, and progress has been made in Anglo-Saxon lexicography during the last fifteen years, we are promised a supplement, "which will be prepared as soon as possible." In such an undertaking it were ungracious to cavil at delay in publication, but we may express the hope that the supplement may appear in less than five years, the average time that has elapsed between the publication of the several parts. The preceding parts have been noticed from time to time in this Journal and the plan of the work is well known to Anglo-Saxon scholars. Prof. Toller informs us in the brief Preface prefixed to this part that "some alterations have been made in the plan adopted by Dr. Bosworth." Forms of Anglo-Saxon words vary in time and in locality; "In the earlier part of the Dictionary the different forms of a word are given separately; in the later part they are collected under a single form." The latter plan is the better, provided that cross-references are always made, which seems to have been done in this part. If Prof. Toller were starting afresh, he would, doubtless, not write now *ea*, *eó*, which "are employed in all cases where the short *ea*, *eo* are not meant," but consistency required that the older representation of the diphthongs should be continued. The modern representations, *ea*, *eo*, are seen in the dictionaries of both Clark Hall and Sweet.

Prof. Toller remarks upon the difficulties that are met with in an attempt to compile an Anglo-Saxon dictionary. Every one that has made the attempt will certainly sympathize with him, even when that attempt has been limited to the compilation of a glossary for some single work, so that "some leniency towards shortcomings may" certainly, not "perhaps, be looked for by any one who attempts the labour," for man is neither all-seeing nor all-knowing. Reasonable diligence is all that can be expected.

An 'Explanation of References' and the 'Contractions used in Grein's *Lexicon Poeticum*' follow the Preface.

As we have remarked before, Prof. Toller's chief service to Anglo-Saxon lexicography consists in the addition of the prose vocabulary to the poetical, and the inclusion of prose citations. In the few words that we have taken as tests, we do not find any important addition to Grein's citations, and often some of Grein's references are omitted. For example, under *Wyn*[*n*] Grein gives twelve references to the *Phoenix*: of these Prof. Toller retains seven, and does not give any additional reference. Perhaps these omissions are due to a desire to save space, but if the system of double references, as "Exon. Th. III, 31; Gú. 135," or "Beo. Th. 3465; B. 1730," had not been adopted, all needful space for more complete references might have been secured. Prof. Toller arranges his meanings under a more analytical system than Grein. Grein gives no subdivisions of meaning under *wyn*. Toller divides into "I. *delight, pleasure*; I a. with prep. *tó*, marking object in which delight is taken; II. *a delight, that which causes pleasure*; II a. as an epithet of persons, (1) of human beings;

(2) of the Deity; III. *the best* of a class, *the pride* of its kind; IV. the name of the w-rune." This is a distinct gain, but, *per contra*, we miss Grein's arrangement of his examples by cases. It should be added that Prof. Toller has verified for himself Grein's citations when used, as may be seen by the fuller quotations, and in one example under *wyn* he has corrected a misreference in Grein, who has "*El.* 1297" for "*Cri.* 1297." Under "the name of the w-rune," he gives the references to the *Elene*, the *Crist*, and the *Runic Poem*, 8, and adds that to the *Fata Apostolorum*, addendum, from Napier's article in *Anglia*, XIII, but omits the references "*Jul.* 706, *Rä.* 87, 7," which Grein gives under *wên*. Toller differs from Grein in taking *wyn*, not *wên*, as the name of this rune, agreeing with Gollancz, but Hall and Sweet hold to the older view. Grein says, however, under *wên*: "Name der Rune V., deren Zeichen jedoch auch zum Teil im Text für *ven* = *vynn* steht." If Grein had lived longer, perhaps he would have taken *wyn*, not *wên*, as the name of the w-rune. (See Gollancz's edition of *Cynewulf's Christ*, Appendix on "The Cynewulf Runes," pp. 173-84.) It may be noted here that at the beginning of the article W Prof. Toller omits to refer to the word under which he cites the w-rune. In the case of the other letters the usual word is given as the name of the corresponding rune.

Under *wên* Grein subdivides: "(1) *Wahn, Meinung, opinio*; (2) *Wahrscheinlichkeit*; (3) *Hoffnung, Erwartung, Aussicht auf etwas*; (4) *Name der Rune V.*" Toller arranges: "I. *supposition, opinion, thought, idea*; II. *hope, expectation*; II a. with gen. of what is hoped for or expected; III. *likelihood, probability, chance*; III a. *in phrases such as wên is (ðæt) = perhaps, perchance, may be, probably*," with *twenty* examples to *four* in Grein under (2), one of which, "B. 1845," is included by Toller under III; Grein does not separate the phrase. One of Grein's references, "*Ps.* 138, 9," is omitted by Toller; this gives a net increase of *seventeen* examples in Toller of the phrase *wên is (ðæt)*. Under (1) Grein gives three examples: "*Boeth.* 40, 3, *Gû.* 988, *Cri.* 212." Of these Toller retains only "*Cri.* 212" under I, places "*Boeth.* 40, 3" under III a, and "*Gû.* 988 (989)" under III. Under I Toller adds *three* from the prose; under III, *none*, but places there "*Jul.* 632" (given by Grein under (3)) in addition to "*Gû.* 989, B. 1845," noted above. "*Rân.* 8" is naturally omitted under II by Toller and included under *wyn*. Toller adds here but *one* example from the prose "*Blickl. Homl.* 179, 25," to those given by Grein, all of which are included under II and II a. We thus see, as previously, Toller's dependence upon Grein for references to the poetry, as was to be expected, but we do not find here such increase from the prose as under III a. Lack of space will not permit further minute examination, but we are grateful for what we have.

The plan of the Student's Dictionaries of Hall and Sweet excludes references, the meanings of words being given as concisely as possible. I must refer to the respective Prefaces for editorial remarks on the plan and arrangement of each. Hall prefixes certain tables which will be found useful by the student: I. Comparative table of vowel-sounds of the Old English dialects in stressed syllables; II. Preferred forms and normalizations; III. Root-vowels of strong verbs, following Sievers's arrangement, now generally adopted by scholars; IV. Index to the graded and mutated vowels found in the parts of strong verbs, with List of Abbreviations used in the dictionary. Sweet prefixes a statement of his arrangement and contractions, variations of spelling, and Early West-Saxon inflections, which might have been dispensed with, as every student of Anglo-Saxon is supposed to have his grammar as accessible as his dictionary. Sweet still sticks to his antiquated arrangement of the strong verbs, but the English are very conservative. Mr. Sweet is hypercritical in his Preface. He says: "Etymological translation should be avoided; thus *geþofsta* does *not* mean 'one who sits on the same rowing-bench.' Less mischievous, but equally silly, is the practice of translating an Old-English word by some obsolete or dialectal word, which is assumed—sometimes falsely—to be connected with the Old-English one. Thus when we have once translated *bearn* by 'child,' there is no more reason for adding 'bairn' than there is for adding 'kid' or any other synonym." These are discourteous thrusts at Mr. Hall. We must confess that we see no "silliness" about it. To find *geþofsta* in Sweet we must look under *þ*, all words with prefix *ge-* being given under the root-word, although there is no such word as *þofsta*. *þofst* is there, and without gender too, as "rower's bench," and *geþofsta*, m. as "companion." Hall gives *geþofsta*, w.m., under *G*. with meaning above quoted, and "comrade, companion" in addition, with references "AO : Æ." Hall gives "*ðofst*, sf., *ðofste*, wf., bench for rowers" (*ðofste* is omitted in Sweet). If we compare Bosworth-Toller we find "*þofst*? *e*; *þofste*, *an*; f. a rower's bench," with references to Wright's Vocabularies, and the additional statement that "Halliwell gives *thofst*, *fellow*, a fellow-oarsman," after the cognates "Du. *doft*, Icel. *þofsta*." Under *-þofsta*, we have "v. *ge-þofsta* [Icel. *þofsti*, a bench-fellow]." Evidently Prof. Toller does not agree with Mr. Sweet as to "etymological translation," and if *ge-þofsta* got its meaning 'companion' from having been originally a comrade on a ship's bench, I see no objection to saying so.

Let us glance at *bearn*. Sweet gives merely "*bearn*, n. child," and "*bearn*, prt. of *beirnan*." Hall gives "*bearn* I. sn. child, son, descendant, offspring, issue, progeny. AO. CP.; Æ. *lioda bearn*, children of men. [*beran*; Scot. and Northern Eng. *bairn*.] II. = *barn*, pret. 3 sg. of *biernan*. III. pret. 3 sg. of *beirnan*. IV. = *bereaern*." Hall is not quite so concise in his definitions as Sweet, and I can see no objection to his adding the etymological

cognate *bairn*. I trust that a regard for the purity of English would have prevented his adding 'kid.' We do not find *barn* in Sweet alphabetically, but under *biernan* we have "*pret. born, a,*" with example *sēo burg barn*, so it does occur. Under *beiernan* we find in Sweet "*pā bearn him on mōde paet hē cōme*"; Sweet has the advantage of Hall in giving examples of the use of words, but as no references are given, we cannot tell whether they are selected or made up. We do not find *beraern* alphabetically in Sweet, but we find *beren* and *berern* = *bern*, *barn*, and "*bern, beren, 1N. berern, n. barn [bere-aern]*," so Mr. Sweet recognizes etymology in definitions, and if he had added the meaning 'barley-house,' I should not have found fault. Hall gives alphabetically "*beraern, sn. barn [bere, aern]*; *beren, III. sn. = bere-aern*; *bern = bereaern*; *baern = bereaern*"; and in addition "*barn, I. pret. 3 sg. of biernan*; *II. = bearn*," so Hall seems to me more helpful to the student in these forms than Sweet.

One other word may be briefly compared for illustration of arrangement. We find in Sweet "*pēoh, n., d. pēo, gpl. pēona, thigh*"; in Hall, "*ðēoh, I. (ē)sn (gs. ðeos, ds. ðeo; gp. ðeona)* [S. 242 and n. 3] thigh, hip. AO., CP.; Æ. II. imperat. of *ðeon* [S. 84, n. 1]." Hall gives frequent references to Sievers's Grammar for forms. Under this word Hall gives *four* compounds, Sweet, *seven*, all of which are found in Bosworth-Toller, but none in Grein. The references show that they come from the prose literature, Cockayne's 'Leechdoms' and Wright's 'Vocabularies' being the sources of the examples. We find also in Sweet *pēo = pēow* and *pēo*, see *pēoh*; and in Hall, "*ðeo I. = ðeow, sm.*; *II. = ðeoh*; *III. [S. 337, n. 2] = sēo II.* *IV. pres. 1 sg. of ðeon*," so Hall is fuller here. Sweet's printers seem to have lost their heads on this page (181), as *pēon* follows *pēo*, col. 1, and *pēonest = pēnest* follows *pēoh-geweald*, col. 3; *pēon* and *gepēon* are out of place alphabetically.

Owing to effort at compression Sweet most frequently takes but one line for a word and gives but one meaning. Hall gives often more than one meaning and so takes more space. Each dictionary has three columns to the page; Hall's containing 369 pages and Sweet's 217. On a rough estimate Hall averages about 110 words to the page and Sweet 135, so that the former contains approximately in round numbers 40,000 words and the latter 30,000. The less cost of Sweet's dictionary will, perhaps, make it the more popular.

Both of these dictionaries are useful additions to the student's outfit for the study of Anglo-Saxon, as the smaller Bosworth is, doubtless, out of print and has been long since antiquated, and Harrison and Baskervill's translation of Groschopp's abridgment of Grein's Glossary applies only to the poetry. It is now customary, however, to append a separate glossary to each Anglo-Saxon work published, so that the need of a separate dictionary is not so great as formerly. The lack of references in

these two dictionaries is a drawback to their use, but references could not have been included without greatly increasing the size and cost of the volumes.

Now that the Bosworth-Toller Dictionary has been completed, with its 1302 pages, double column, it will be used by all who can afford it, but there is still room for a dictionary between it and the smaller ones, which shall contain some references for each word cited, and be more complete than either of the smaller dictionaries, even if at slightly increased cost. After the supplement is completed, we hope that Prof. Toller will give us such an abridgment.

JAMES M. GARNETT.

REPORTS.

THE JOURNAL OF GERMANIC PHILOLOGY. Edited by GUSTAF E. KARSTEN. Vol. I, 1897. Numbers 2, 3 and 4.

The first volume of the Journal of Germanic Philology has in these three numbers fully realized the expectations which its first number had aroused. The various articles show a broad range of interest and a spirit of thorough scholarship which are a credit to the general scholarship of this country and promise well for the future of the Journal.

The second number opens with an article by Elisabeth Woodbridge (Yale University) on Chaucer's Classicism (pp. 111-17). Miss Woodbridge discusses the essence of classicism and romanticism, and adopts as a description of the former the view of Brunetière (*Études Critiques*, vol. III, 202), and finds in Pater (*Appreciations*, p. 248) the 'most far-reaching and psychologically adequate suggestion (of the essence of romanticism) that we can find,' though allowing that both tendencies may be united in one individual. Chaucer, judged by his works merely, is possibly outside the pale of classicism as defined by Brunetière. For the English language of Chaucer's time had not yet reached the 'classic stage,' that is 'perfection,' and 'freed from foreign influences.' Besides, in Chaucer's works there is a lack of architectural proportion. Again, he was not a reactionary against the earlier conventions which might be called romantic. On the other hand, though Chaucer took as his themes 'romantic themes' narrowly so called, yet his attitude towards them shows 'shrewdness' and 'composed comfortable genius,' which are qualities never properly attributed to a romanticist pure and simple. The article sums up in these words: "If he had lived in the days of romanticism he might have been outwardly tinged by it . . . but a true romanticist he could hardly have been."

Pp. 118-35. Ewald Flügel (Stanford University), Some Notes on Chaucer's Prologue, contributes some "selections from a great number of 'Chaucerania' consisting of new parallels, textual emendations, and explanatory matter, collected in the course of my work at the CHAUCER LEXICON." The notes thus contributed deal with vv. 1-9; 9-10; 60; 91; Chaucer and 'Nembrot,' v. 177; vv. 212 and 248, all of the Prologue. The new parallels were 'yielded mainly by a verbal concordance to Gower's *Confessio Amantis* and a word-index to Wycliffe's *Minor Writings*.'

Pp. 136-219. George H. McKnight (Cornell University), *The Primitive Teutonic Order of Words*. The author defines the method by which he proposes to make a collation of all known facts and results known about Teutonic Order of Words and to establish his conclusions. There is a twofold meaning in the phrase 'order of words,' which refers either to a subjective or to an objective movement, to the order in which thought elements receive expression or to the relative position of the essential terms of a proposition. The subjective order is generally in the progression of ideas from the known to the unknown, from the 'psychological subject' which comes first to the 'psychological predicate' which comes last. Subjective word-order is influenced by the nature of the clause; imperative clauses differ from affirmative clauses in their nature and hence in order, as do principal and subordinate clauses. Emphasis is a potent influence in shaping subjective word-order and so is force, but clearness exercises the 'most potent influence.' Clearness is promoted by putting next to each other words connected in thought; hence the arrangement of words in a clause 'is determined primarily by the nearness of their relation to each other.' Analogy also influences word-order, and so does style, the order of prose being quite different from that of poetry, which employs mostly the 'pathetic order.' These factors determine word-order in all languages.

'Order of words' may denote an objective movement, referring to the relative positions of the three essentials of a sentence, viz. *subject, object, predicate*. Order of words in this sense is the subject of the discussion. In uninflected languages this order shows syntactical relations, while in inflected languages a traditional order will gradually establish itself and become fixed. The general principles of 'emphasis,' 'clearness' and 'force' above enumerated operate within the restraints of such a fixed order. The recent investigations of Wunderlich and Braune do not cover the ground which the author intends to investigate, for the problem proposed is: "Did not this freedom of position (established by Braune's investigation of the position of the verb in a clause) exist within the restraint of a fixed order of syntactical terms?" As I.E. in its earliest stages was probably uninflected, the order of syntactical relations was probably not free. The most natural order is that of the language of the deaf and dumb, *subject, object, verb*. The evidence of verbal forms in I.E. shows that the predicate precedes the subject, while in compounds the object precedes the predicate. Hence the primitive order is *object, predicate, subject*. In the earliest monuments, particularly Lat. and Lith., the predicate came last, a fact substantiated by O.Pers. and Sk., though in Gk., Russ., Armen. and Celt. traces of this order are few. In Sk. and Lat. the relative position of subject and object was variable, but the tendency was to place the *subject* before the *object* and then followed the *predicate*. In

principal propositions, in order to distinguish them from subordinate propositions, the primitive order was inverted, and 'to the type of order, then, *object, predicate, subject*, may be added a second type, probably used concurrent with the first, and probably soon becoming dominant, *subject, object, predicate*.' This theory of the final position of the verb is supported by Delbrück (*Syntaktische Forschungen*, IV), so that all evidence *à priori* and *à posteriori* points to the position of the verb at the end of a clause. This position would also be expected in Teutonic order, since Teutonic 'could hardly have been independent of the parent language in this matter.'

The writer then proceeds to investigate the internal evidence, taking up first Gothic, which presents material of but little value, since Gothic is such a faithful reproduction of the Greek, and even the Skeireins may be a translation from the Latin. The conclusions of a careful study of available materials are: "On the whole we must conclude that the Gothic order of words was by no means rigidly fixed . . . On the other hand, in both works (Skeireins and the Bible) there is a manifest fondness for the synthetic order. The governing word, noun or verb, usually comes after the governed word, thus binding the parts of the expression into a closely united whole."

In the study of Old High German order of words, McKnight takes the results established by others, but formulates them more conveniently for reference and comparison with results obtained independently in Gothic and Old English. The results of such comparison lead to the conclusion: "we must infer that at the time when the earliest works that have descended to us were composed, there already existed a feeling for the difference between principal and subordinate clauses, expressed by a difference in word-order. . . . O.H.G., then, does not afford us much direct evidence as to the order of words in primitive Teutonic."

The order of words in Old Norse the author is obliged to treat inadequately because of the limitations of the article, the lack of former investigations and the unsatisfactory character of the materials for study. In the younger Edda the order of words is much like that of the English, with some striking exceptions. The study of the Runic inscriptions, though slender, 'shows that the synthetic order was the earliest, and that the order of words characteristic of literary Icelandic does not belong to primitive Teutonic.'

Ries furnishes the statistics for the order of words in O.S. The tendency is to the employment of the normal order, though the inverted order is nearly as common. In subordinate sentences 70 per cent. of the instances separate subject and verb. In O.E. many statistics have been furnished by other investigators, while McKnight presents the results of his studies in Alfred's and Cnut's Code. In early O.E. the differentiation between principal and subordinate clauses was not strongly marked, and in the later

(prose) works is barely holding its own. The general conclusion of the detailed investigation by Dr. McKnight is that from the very beginning 'each dialect differed from the others, not only in phonology and inflections, but also in word-order.' In O.H.G. principal clauses are distinguished from subordinate, in O.E. this is not the case, while in O.N. a peculiar tendency to invert is discernible even in the primitive inscriptions. As to the relative position of subject and finite verb, the original word-order in affirmative clauses of primitive Teutonic is direct, the verb following directly after the subject. Inversion is difficult of explanation; 'all that can be asserted is that it is an order of words occurring side by side with the direct order in all the early Teutonic dialects.' An explanation for certain cases of inversion is to be found in the nature of a clause, in emphasis or connection. The development of inversion was different in different dialects. As to the position of the verb with relation to its dependencies, it is to be noticed that in all Teutonic dialects the verb, in both principal and subordinate clauses, may be separated from its subject; the older the monument, the more frequent the separation in principal clauses. McKnight agrees with Behagel that in primitive Teutonic the verb was at the end, a belief confirmed by the evidence from cognate I.E. languages. The analytic order was developed by the growth of sentences in complexity, which tended to make the verbal nouns and adjectives the bearers of the principal thought, and to make the verb more and more colorless, often reducing it to a mere copula. Hence the verb lost its claim to the position of emphasis at the end of a clause. The differentiation between principal and subordinate clauses noted by Ries in his study of *Beowulf* and *Heliand* substantiates this theory. Summing up, "from the evidence of cognate I.E. languages, from the general direction of the development within Teutonic, and from the tendencies common to all early Teutonic languages, viz. 1) the position of elements in compounds, especially the position of the inseparable prefix, 2) the frequent end-position of the verb even in principal clauses, more frequent the farther back we go, and 3) the fondness for synthetic order;— from all this evidence I conclude that in primitive Teutonic, in affirmative clauses, which were probably of the very simplest nature, the normal position of the verb was after its dependencies."

Pp. 220-38. Hermann Collitz (Bryn Mawr College), *Der Name der Goten bei Griechen und Römer*. This article 1) discusses the origin of the *o* in the Greek and Latin spelling of the name of the Goths, and 2) criticizes and refutes the theory advanced by Osthoff and Streitberg that the so-called *a-Umlaut* of *u* to *o* goes back to the '*gemeingermanische Zeit*.' In the period preceding 200 A. D. the Goths are mentioned by contemporary writers six times. Only three cases, as Collitz shows, are of value as testimony: 1) *Gutones* (Plin.), 2) *Gotones* or *Gothones* (Tac.), 3)

γίθωνες, i. e. Gythones (Marinus cited by Ptol.). Of these Plin. is correct, while Tac. and Ptol. attempted to reproduce the short German *u* sound in Latin and Greek. Tac. either did not know that the spelling of Plin. was correct, or else in transcribing the name the change might have been made. A later scribe might have made the change, or, since there is only one original MS of the Germania and one of the first six books of the Annals, both of the XVth century when the name of Goths was spelled with an *o*, it is not at all certain that we have Tacitus's correct spelling. In the period during which the Goths were settled on the Lower Danube the name occurs more frequently in the Gk. form *Γότθαι*, Lat. *Gothi*, other spellings being rare and isolated. Collitz proves by a number of arguments that the Goths called themselves *Gutōs*, and that the Roman spelling *Gothi* was due to the pronunciation of the Greeks, who generally represent short *u* by *o*, as their alphabet lacked that sound. The *th* (Gk. *τθ*) in *Gothi* and the form *Gothones* are uncertain as to origin. Streitberg and Osthoff claim that the Latin spelling with *o* is the older form and that this proves that an *a-Umlaut* existed in earlier Gothic, the later Gothic changing back to *Gutones*. According to Collitz, even if Tacitus's spelling is the one he wrote, there is no evidence that he visited the Goths, nor is it probable that he heard the name from a Goth in Rome; but more probably he obtained his information from some West German in Rome, in whose dialect the *a-Umlaut* was effective. Collitz also shows that Streitberg's theory, when examined in the light of chronology, becomes absurd and absolutely untenable.

Pp. 239-46. H. Schmidt-Wartenberg (University of Chicago), The Berlin Fragment of the Madelghijs. A Middle-Low-Franconian fragment in the Royal Library at Berlin, containing two partly mutilated quarto sheets, belonging to the XIVth century and written by one hand, is identified as a Low Franconian translation of the *Maugis d'Aigremont*. This translation is known only in fragments already published by N. de Pauw. The Berlin fragment is an independent copy, which the author has supplemented from other fragments. The fragment of 342 vv. with minor lacunae follows.

Pp. 247-8. A. S. Cook (Yale University), Christ 77, an emendation of line 77 by substituting *mōt* (= mote, atom) for *mōd*.

Pp. 249-51. H. Schmidt-Wartenberg (University of Chicago), Conrad Vollstatter's Gedicht von des Teufel's Töchtern. A reprint of a short poem, 'Von des tūfels töchtern, der siben waren,' found in a codex in the Royal Library at Berlin. It was written by Conrat Vollstatter, probably a Bavarian, who, however, amounts to nothing as a poet. The poem is shown to be a fragment, and a number of similar versions in German, Italian and French are cited.

No. 3.

Pp. 273-80. Albert S. Cook (Yale University), The College Teaching of English. The object of this article is to suggest rather than to elaborate a theory of teaching English. After showing that such teaching has two ends in view, the elevation of the individual and the advancement of 'the great ends of communal, civic and national life,' and discussing how these ends are attained, the writer makes the following practical suggestions for teaching English effectively. 1. Organization with a clearly defined and comprehensive purpose, in which all members of the teaching body should co-operate in broad sympathy. 2. A unity in the teaching of the three main branches: literature, language and rhetoric. 3. A sufficiently large staff of equally well-trained instructors, but of different ages, temperaments and special inclinations. 4. The topics treated should 'denote an approximately homogeneous content,' and 5. should be arranged in a rational and self-consistent plan. 6. The method employed should secure the co-operation of every student at every stage of its progress; preferably the topical method of investigation to be employed with only occasional formal lectures; also occasional supplementary courses for 'mere entertainment or information.' 7. Every teacher should be an investigator who publishes the result of his labors from time to time, and ought therefor to have leisure for the acquisition and development of scholarship. 8. Every student should have an opportunity to study English throughout the whole of every year of his college course.

Pp. 280-309. Francis A. Wood (Cornell College, Mt. Vernon, Iowa), Indo-European Root-Formation. The author, following out the method of root-analysis suggested by Per Persson in his *Studien zur Lehre von der Wurzelweiterung und Wurzelvariation*, tries to establish the principle that the large number of roots with the same meaning in various I.E. languages may be reduced to a comparatively small number of roots, for the most part monosyllables beginning with a vowel, and that all suffixes and prefixes may also be reduced to such roots. This principle, if established, would change entirely the explanation of the verbal augment, the reduplication and vowel gradation. He treats first of nominal and verbal suffixes. These are connected with demonstrative basal roots, which are likewise the bases of personal pronouns. A second set of suffixes are 'not of pronominal origin, or at least not connected with stems of pronouns as such.' E. g. *-(e)lo-*, *(e)ro-*, denoting agency or instrument, are connected with the roots **el* (Gk. *ἐλ-θεῖν*) 'to spring from' and **er* (Lat. *or-ior*, Gk. *ἐρ-χόμεναι*) 'to spring up' respectively. These roots developed still further into *-telo*, *-tel*, *-tlo* and *-tero*, *-ter*. A number of other suffixes are explained by a similar method, amongst others the suffixes *es*, *os*, 'occurring in nouns and in verbs in forming desideratives, the future and the aorist, as well

as the infinitive, Sk. *-sē*, Gk. *-σαι*, Lat. *-re*, are claimed to contain the root *es-* 'to be,' according to an abandoned theory of Bopp, which Wood now revives. In the prefixes, 'which are not easy to analyze and determine,' Wood believes that similar basal roots are to be found, though covered up. Hence all roots admit of being derived from monosyllabic roots beginning with a vowel. Eight such roots (viz. 1. \sqrt{es} 'to be'; 2. $\sqrt{*sē}$ or $\sqrt{*es}$ 'to be heavy'; 3. \sqrt{em} 'to bruise'; 4. \sqrt{es} 'throw'; 5. \sqrt{su} 'sound' connected with \sqrt{es} 'throw.' 6. \sqrt{su} 'to be hot,' probably related to 5; 7. \sqrt{en} 'to float, swim'; 8. $\sqrt{eu(e)}$ 'clothe') are followed through a large number of words. 'The comparisons might be extended, not only in these stems, but in others.'

The augment is taken by the author to be the vowel *e*, which was the initial vowel of most verbs; in present tenses it was dropped, because the accent was shifted to the defining element of the tense, that part which expresses present action [e. g. **(e)bhéro*], while in the past tense the accent remained on the initial vowel (**ēbhero-*), and finally this initial *e* was looked upon as the distinguishing mark of the past. The reduplication would then be simply a repetition of the root in its simple form, the vowel being generally *e*, the usual initial root vowel. The vowel-gradation series would have to be explained as originating from different suffixes, as Wood has shown to be the case with the O.N. forms *blōta* : *blēt* in a thesis published in the University of Chicago Germanic Studies, a method of explanation applicable to 'many verbs of the ablauting series.'

This article is continued in the fourth number of the Journal, pp. 441-70. In this second part the author discusses and traces through many forms the following roots: 9. $\sqrt{*ebh}$ 'rise,' which is found in a large number of roots beginning with I.E. *bh*; 10. \sqrt{er} 'to move, go'; 11. $\sqrt{el-}$, similar in meaning and development to *er-*; 12. $\sqrt{qel-}$ 'to set in motion,' from an original *qo* or *eqo*; 13. $\sqrt{pel-}$, which is developed out of original *ēp*, used to express rapid motion of any kind; 14. \sqrt{per} 'to advance.' The principle upon which Wood proceeds in his etymologies and derivations is found in the following statement: "Wherever the root *qel-* occurs—and this applies to any other root—the presumption should be that it is in each case the same element. Those who deny this should prove it. Of course, exactly the same combination may originate from different elements, but such cases are comparatively rare. Therefore, when a certain root, or element, appears in words of widely different meaning, it is only necessary to show that one meaning may develop from another, in order to prove the possibility of connection." Wood sums up by saying that numberless examples might be quoted to substantiate his theory; that in analyzing forms and words the etymologist should proceed on the assumption that '*phonetically identical roots are one in origin.*' He holds that all the common elements which go to make up the I.E. languages have been

preserved, some forming the bases of what we call 'roots,' others forming suffixes. In the *Ursprache* there was a certain number of elements or roots, combined to a greater or less extent into words. "Each tribe took with it this common stock, and combined and recombined the roots as it had been accustomed to do or as it had need. Hence came overlappings of meaning, and occasionally one set of meanings in one dialect, and another in another."

Pp. 309-12. Francis A. Wood (Cornell College, Mt. Vernon, Iowa), I.E. *Nr* and *Nl* in Germanic. Through a large number of etymologies Wood deduces the principle that I.E. *nr* becomes (*n*)*dr* in Latin and Germanic as it does in Greek; while *nl* becomes medial *ndl* in Germanic and simple *l* when initial.

Pp. 312-34. Otto B. Schlutter (Hartford High School), On Old English Glosses, contributes a second article, which 'rescues' from the glosses forty-four additional words omitted by Sweet and discusses a number of others wrongly explained by the same author.

Pp. 334-8. Albert S. Cook (Yale University), Notes on the Old English Christ, proposes to retain the word *gefælsian*, v. 320, and translate it by 'pass through,' and in v. 952 to emend *fære* and read *fere* (Anglian for *fære*), meaning 'fear.'

Pp. 338-41. Elisabeth Woodbridge (Yale University), An Unnoted Source of Chapman's All Fools, shows by comparing parallel passages that two characters in the play, Gostanzo and Valerio, with respect to their activity in the plot correspond to Chremes and Clitipho in *Heautontimorumenos* of Terence, 'considered with respect to certain phases of their characterization, they are to be referred to the Adelphi.'

Pp. 341-7. George Hempl (University of Michigan), *G. Skalks*, N.H.G. *Schalk*, etc., *G. Kalkjo*, O.N. *Skækja*, O.H.G. *Karl*, N.H.G. *Kerl*, *Kegel*, etc., connects these various Germanic words etymologically, showing the different phonetic changes and the causes of these changes, citing other analogous forms.

P. 347. Edwin W. Fay (Lexington, Va.) explains German *Gipfel* as a 'blend' of *Zipfel* with either *Giebel* or M.H.G. *Gupf* or both; and English *squawk* as a 'blend' of *squall* and *squeak* with a 'dash' perhaps of *quack*.

Pp. 348-60. Otto Heller (Washington University, St. Louis, Mo.), Goethe and the Philosophy of Schopenhauer, seeks to show three things. First, 'that these two thinkers held each other in exceedingly high regard; secondly, that in some important respects their world-views were strikingly alike'; and, finally, that in their lives and works there is evidence to prove 'that Goethe was one of the determinative factors in the construction of Neo-Pessimism.' Heller shows how Goethe and young Scho-

penhauer used to meet quite frequently in Frau Schopenhauer's home in Weimar, and proves the interest shown by Goethe in the career of the philosopher, and the respect and reverence the latter always felt for the poet. In a number of important features, e. g. their style of writing, their conception of the mission of art and philosophy, their view of the connection between art and science, their cosmopolitanism, the author demonstrates similarity between these great minds. Then, in more detail, by quotations from his works, by a certain passage in *Faust* (vv. 1336, 37) he seeks to establish the fact of Goethe's influence upon Schopenhauer's pessimistic view of life, and concludes: Goethe 'threw a strong ferment into the philosopher's mind,' 'provoking him into systematic opposition' by the optimistic views embodied in *Faust*.

No. 4.

Pp. 411-30. William Allan Neilson (Harvard University), *The Original of The Complaynt of Scotlande*. This work, written during 'the childhood of Mary of Scots' after the humiliating defeat at Pinkie and while the Protector Somerset was still pressing the 'bitter wooing' of the infant Queen for Edward VI, was borrowed in its general idea and also with many details of its allegory from 'Le Quadrilogue Invecitif' of Alain Chartier. This latter work was produced in France, early in the XVth century, shortly after the coronation of Henry VI as king and was intended to arouse the French to a sense of their shame. Neilson proves his assertions by a detailed comparison in parallel columns.

Pp. 430-41. William H. Hulme (Western Reserve University), *Malchus*, gives a reprint of this Old English text from the manuscript. It has been published before, but is not generally accessible; hence this reprint.

Pp. 441-70 contain F. A. Wood's second article noted above.

Pp. 470-75. George Hempl (University of Michigan), Germanic $\bar{e}]^{nas}$ = Old English \bar{o} and \bar{a} ; and Vowel-shortening in Primitive Old English. Hempl discusses and explains the O.E. form $*span-$ by the side of $*spon-$ and $sp\bar{o}n$, which is an exception to Holtzmann's law that Gc. \bar{e} before a nasal becomes \bar{o} in Old English, and formulates two principles to determine the real length of seemingly long vowels in O.E. "I. If the long vowel in question regularly underwent a certain modification (for example, that of \bar{a} to \bar{o} before nasals), but in a particular case did not do so before two consonants, we have a right to assume that it had become short, and, if we find that there is nothing in the form to make this assumption impossible, we must recognize the shortness. II. If the long vowel in question suffers before two consonants a change that we know to be characteristic of short vowels only (for example, breaking), or permits a change (for example, the excrescence of a stop between two sonorous conso-

nants) that a long vowel would not permit, we cannot but recognize that shortening has taken place."

Pp. 475-7. Albert S. Cook (Yale University), *The Sources of Two Similes in Chapman's The Revenge of Bussy D'Ambois*. One simile occurring in act II, sc. 1 is traced to Catullus 22, and another occurring a little earlier is suggested by the Aesopic Fable 184.

Pp. 477-81. H. D. Blackwell (Yale University), *Middle English -wȝ-, -wō-*, contributes a number of additional illustrations to an article by George Hempl (*Journal*, p. 14 ff.).

Pp. 481-93. Max Batt (University of Chicago), *Schiller's Attitude towards the French Revolution*. Schiller was not an adherent nor even a friend of the Revolution, though he grew more and more interested, until in 1793 he proposed to write a defence of Louis XVI; from that time on his interest waned, though it did not cease altogether. Batt traces in Schiller's correspondence allusions to contemporaneous events, to books and notices treating directly or indirectly of France and its history and to conversations with people who had been to Paris and were passing through Weimar. 'As a public man,' he urges Körner 'to descant on the Revolution of Cromwell,' speaks favorably of Wilhelm von Humboldt's 'Ideen zu einem Versuch die Grenzen der Wirksamkeit eines Staates zu bestimmen,' and Dec. 21, 1792, announces his intention to write a public defence of Louis XVI, a plan not carried out because Louis was executed within a month. Batt agrees with Goedeke in thinking that the fundamental thoughts of this defence were the origin of the first letters 'Ueber die Erziehung des Menschen.' After the publication of the 'Aesthetische Briefe,' Schiller's interest in contemporaneous political events decreases, though he does occasionally refer to them. Quotations are given by the writer from many sources showing Schiller's unfavorable views of the Revolution and the reasons for these views.

The *Book Reviews*, which fill 97 pages (part 2, pp. 251-72; part 3, pp. 360-410; and part 4, pp. 493-521) are very carefully and well done, and cover a wide selection of recent works in the fields of general Germanic literature and philology.

YALE UNIVERSITY.

GUSTAV GRUENER.

ENGLISCHE STUDIEN, Vol. XXII.

L. Kellner. Shelley's *Queen Mab* and Volney's *Les Ruines*. Besides Holbach's *Système de la Nature* and passages in Godwin's *Enquirer* and *Political Justice*, which Shelley mentions in his notes, a more important source is Volney's *Les Ruines*. From the former *Queen Mab* derives its atheism, from the latter

a sort of deistic optimism. In some details also the influence is apparent. Thus Volney is carried from the ruins of Palmyra (cf. *Q. M.* II 109 ff.) far above the earth, that the Spirit may show him the Past, the Present, and the Future. In both poems we find the doctrine of Necessity, the horrid aspect of war, and the confusion of religions. The influence of Volney's Past and Present is especially marked, while traces of the second part of his work are visible in *The Revolt of Islam*, such as the description of the Future, and the last struggle of people with tyrants. Interesting parallels are cited from each poem.

Ph. Aronstein. *The Development of Local Government in England in the Last Decade (1885-95)*. Beginning with the establishment of counties (871-975), the paper mentions the Justice of the Peace and his constables, who, dating from 1360, had extensive powers of local management. In the 18th century the landed aristocracy gained ascendancy, while the middle classes withdrew from public life. The reforms which followed were reforms first of central government, then of local administration. The years 1832, 1867, and 1885 saw the suffrage made almost universal, though the new methods of administration, except for the schools, were strongly bureaucratic under the Local Government Board. Its service was salaried and devoid of personal interest in local affairs, and the middle classes still remained aloof from public life. The reform of administration came in the laws of 1888 and 1894. The number of counties was increased, and the new County Councils and County Aldermen manage the property as the Justices had done formerly. London was made a county and its administration was unified. The bill of 1894 went still farther in providing Parish Councils, Parish Meetings, and District Councils. The suffrage was extended to all holders of independent property, including women, servants, and farm hands. As a result of the contest with the lords, who were perverting the use of lands and driving the small tenants into cities, the parish has gained the right of renting single tracts of an acre under certain restrictions. The reforms show a new confidence in the masses, mark the abolition of the 'squirearchy,' and offer inducements to education for public life.

The reviews contain, among other notices, favorable comment on two American books, namely, Turk's edition of the legal code of Alfred and Emerson's *History of the English Language*. In commenting upon Ackermann's reprint of Chettle's *Tragedy of Hoffman* from the quarto of 1631, Sarrazin recommends reprints of only the classics which have linguistic or textual importance. Such editions as the present one are quite superfluous. Koch agrees with Westenholz, who, in his study, *Die Tragik in Shakespeare's Coriolanus*, opposes the theory that this tragedy was one of a proposed Roman trilogy. Lindner's study of Fielding's dramatic works shows that, in spite of careless workmanship, these may help to remove our misunderstanding of

'the age of enlightenment.' To a similar end the reviewer, Bobertag, cites Elwin's Commentary on Pope's Essay on Man. Fielding is influenced by Molière and the Spanish drama, but gives to all he borrows an English character. Kölbing, in his review of Hordern's edition of Byron's *Siege of Corinth*, supplements the editor's notes and adds new comments of his own.

The Miscellen contain a note on Byron's *Manfred*, in which drama the opening of II 4 and the Mont Blanc passage in I 1 are suggested possibly by Shelley's fourth letter to Peacock (Forman, VI 185 ff.). Shakespeare, *Timon*, IV 3. 438 ff. is referred to the *Anacreontea* 21 [19], Bergk's *Anth. Lyric*. The resemblance was noted by T. Moore in his translation of *Anacreon*.

R. Thurneysen. When did the Saxons come to England? The article is an extension of one in *Zeitsch. für Celt. Philol.* I 157 ff. According to the Gallic Chronicle for 409/410, Germanic tribes under the name of Saxons devastated the British coast at that time. As to the date of their landing Bede is usually followed, who names 449. Gildas, on whom he is thought to have relied, is indefinite, though he seems to put the date later than 446, and lived soon after the event. Two Continental writings point to an earlier date and their testimony is not necessarily contradicted. The Gallic Chronicle says that in 441/442 the Saxons conquered Britain after varying fortunes of war. The *Life of St. Germanus* (Act. Sanct. Jul. 31), in connection with Prosper Tiro, Chron. min. I 472, fixes the landing in 429. According to Nennius, *Hist. Brit.* 31 (ca. 679) and *Annales Cambriae* (954) it occurred in 428. These last sources, from internal evidence, seem quite independent of one another. The way in which the event is associated with Germanus' arrival in Britain, and his relation to Guorthigirn, implies different British traditions pointing to this one date (428). Having landed, then, at this date, by 441/442 the Saxons had overcome the British, who in 446, according to Gildas and Bede, appealed to Aetius, the consul, for aid.

F. Kluge shows traces of a French influence in proper names and other words of the *Ormmulum*, which escaped the notice of Ten Brink and Morris.

The articles on Lord Byron as a Translator, by F. Maychrzak, are continued from vol. XXI, with abundant citations from the *Nisus*, the *Morgante Maggiore*, and the lesser translations, in parallel with similar passages from original works.

English Grammar receives a contribution from O. Schulze on the article before titled names and on the position of the genitive.

Kaluza reviews at some length Skeat's edition of Chaucer and commends it, adopting as a standard the previous editions of the poet, rather than the ideal edition. Of especial interest are

Kaluza's comments on Skeat's opinion of the authenticity of the Romaunt of the Rose.

Vol. XXII has given considerable space to reviews of helps and reports of the theories bearing upon the reform in the teaching of modern languages in Germany. Among the text-books reviewed are F. Schmidt's Text-book of Spoken English according to the Observation-Method, and J. Bierbaum's Text-book and Reader according to the Inductive Method (pp. 113, 115). The reviews on pp. 307 ff. illustrate the plan of providing reading-lessons drawn from English life and history. Mention should be made of Hartmann's pamphlet on the observation-method (p. 315). Among the Miscellen is a report of the forty-third meeting of philologists in Cologne, in which translation is not advised. Its substitute is dictation and written answers to French and English questions. Early reading-lessons are followed by oral and written reproduction of the subject-matter. Grammar is employed only as a reinforcement of knowledge already acquired, and it must be taught phonologically (p. 335).

A. Treichel. *Sir Cleges*, a Middle English Romance. *Sir Cleges* is an Arthurian story of the early 15th century, printed by Weber in his *Metrical Romances*, Edinburgh, 1810, but overlooked by Ten Brink and Körting, and briefly mentioned by Brandl (*Paul's Grundriss*, II 1. 697). Weber's only MS was in the Advocates' Library, Edinburgh. Another, which is less accurate but more complete, has since been discovered in the Bodleian. Both are here printed in parallel. *Sir Cleges* having spent his all on Christmas entertainments, was mourning in his garden on Christmas eve, when he found cherries miraculously growing there. He started to bear a basket of the fruit to the king, but was intercepted by the porter, the usher, and the steward, each of whom detained him until he promised a third of his reward. From the king he then asked for twelve stripes, which were divided among the three officers, while *Sir Cleges* was restored to his old position. This episode has occurred frequently in story. Many instances are cited, of which the oldest is the Oriental story of Nasureddin. It is found also in Grimm's tales (7), in Wright's *Selection of Latin Stories* (VIII 122), and in the *Old English Jest-Books*. It forms the plot of a novel of Sachetti (195) and of the German poem on the parson of Kalenberg (late 14th century), and is one of the *Nouveaux Contes à Rire* (1702). Instances of similar motives are cited. The meter of *Sir Cleges* is the twelve-lined, tail-rime strophe, *aab ccb ddb eeb*, with slight variations. Most of the few assonances and impure rimes are due to the scribe. The alliterations are treated according to Regel's scheme. The rhythm, based only on the verses exactly corresponding in each MS, reveals occasional anacrusis, generally silent final *e*, and a weak plural ending *es* and final *er* before a vowel. The dialect is probably North-Midland.

A. B. Grosart. Was Robert Greene Substantially the Author of *Titus Andronicus*? The first point rests upon Ravenscroft's statement of a reasonable stage-tradition that the play was not Shakespeare's originally, but written by a private author and touched up by Shakespeare. Langbaine, Henslowe, and the Stationers' Register point to an edition of 1594, which Grosart considers identical with the play in the quartos of 1600 and 1611, doing away with the idea of two plays on this subject. He thinks that Henslowe's mention of a *Titus and Vespacia* does not refer to *Andronicus*, while the so-called German translation of an earlier *Andronicus* is but an adaptation of the play we know. Meres' mention of it as Shakespeare's is a result of his peculiar arrangement of titles, and the play appeared in the folio of 1623, because, as Ravenscroft says, the MS was in Shakespeare's hands. Of the internal arguments three are specified: (1) A turn of expression in *Andronicus*, II 1. 82, 83 occurs in Greene's *Planetomachia* (1585) and in his *Perimedes* (1588). (2) The repulsive subject and treatment are foreign to Shakespeare, but characteristic of Greene, especially in his *Selimus*, which Grosart considers the extreme example of this sort. Certain metrical and descriptive similarities are to be found, besides others illustrated by citations. (3) *Andronicus* contains frequent classical allusions of rather wide range, which is not characteristic of Shakespeare, and many favorite words of Greene occur, of which Grosart gives lists. In conclusion he cites passages to show the tempering hand of Shakespeare in the play.

Ph. Aronstein's article on the Reform of the Higher School-System in England is a summary of the Report of the Royal Commission on Secondary Education.

In the Miscellen K. Horst prints part of the remains of MS G of the Old English Annals, with a description.

YALE UNIVERSITY.

CHARLES GROSVENOR OSGOOD, JR.

BRIEF MENTION.

In a recent number of the *Rheinisches Museum* Professor USENER has published an important supplement to his *Götternamen*, called *Göttliche Synonyme*,¹ in which he treats the phenomenon of double paternity. As a rule the gods were not jealous of human successors so long as they respected the shrine which held the σπέρμα θεοῦ καθαρόν (P. P. 3, 15). If Ischys had waited, he might have had the credit of Asklepios. But sometimes, and that with impunity, the human rival follows so closely on the heels of his divine predecessor that one birth must needs suffice for heroes of diverse paternity: such as Herakles and Iphikles, Kastor and Polydeukes. And then again family considerations operate to veil the divine origin of a hero, and Theseus, the son of Poseidon, is called the son of Aigeus. The details of these paternal doublets form a large part of the *chronique scandaleuse* of the Olympian gods, and what the irreverence of later times could make of such situations is amply shown by the Amphitruo of Plautus. But when closely examined the human parent vanishes. Deukalion the father of Hellen is one with Zeus the father of Hellen. Tyndareos the Masher is the same as Zeus the Crusher. Amphitryon is the double-ender thunderbolt, and Aigeus, the God of the Billow, is a synonym of Poseidon, as has long been suspected. The name of the so-called human father, it is true, is sometimes no more transparent than is that of the god himself; but we are dealing with an old stratification which Professor USENER has shown to be full of strange fossils. Ixion, as we have all read, had reason to be jealous of Zeus, for the same reason that Iago was jealous of the Moor, and under the *lex talionis* his wooing of Hera was not without some justification nor her encouragement of his suit; but what if Zeus is Ixion as Hera is Dia, Ixion's wife? One's head turns as many ways as Ixion's sun-wheel in Pindar (P 2, 21), and one expects to find next that Koronis's second sweetheart, Ischys, was Apollo himself. As Professor USENER says, the field is wide and inviting, but who shall bring to bear the same power of combination and the same range of knowledge as the scholar who has explored for so many years the vast domain of Greek religion and Greek mythology?

¹ See A. J. P. XVII 366-76.

The first anniversary of LANE's death witnesses the publication of his long-expected *Latin Grammar*, under the editorship of his pupil, Professor MORGAN, of Harvard (Harper and Brothers). Bound as I am by ties of friendship and affinity to the lamented scholar, I dare not say what I would about the monument which this rare genius has reared and which loving hands have unveiled. No impersonal criticism is possible for me, and others must estimate the value of this contribution of a lifetime to English literature as well as to Latin scholarship. The careful workmanship of the philologist is matched by the *curiosa felicitas* of the literary artist, and LANE's *Latin Grammar* will always be a touchstone by which to judge the delicate appreciation of either tongue. But one thing must be said: that there could be no more noble testimony to LANE's influence as a teacher—and his great work in life was a teacher's work—than the sympathetic spirit in which Professor MORGAN has carried out his master's plans. To have inspired such devotion and to have transmitted such consecration is the fortune of few.

Professor SHOREY's edition of *Horace's Odes and Epodes* (B. H. Sanborn), with its wealth of literary illustration, is worth more than all the discourses on the indefeasibility of classical studies that I have ever heard or read or haply written or delivered. All modern literature is haunted by echoes of Horace, and not to catch these echoes is to lose the delight in the *iocosa imago*. And when there is no echo but only coincidence, the parallel gives us assurance of a kinship of thought and feeling that brings our *vaster Flaccus* very near to our hearts, if he were not playing about them already.

In LANE's *Latin Grammar* and SHOREY's *Horace* the current year has brought us two noteworthy contributions to classical study, both by mature scholars, of whom one is beyond the reach of our praise, the other is still in the heyday of fruitful activity. A third contribution, Dr. HAYLEY's *Alcestis* (Ginn), is by one of the new generation, and shows that the critical field in which comparatively little has been done by our countrymen is not to be without adequate representation of American scholarship. Here we have a work that is not 'based' on any of the editions of any previous commentator, 'German or other,' and inasmuch as the Journal has over and over urged on American scholars the duty of more independent work, the appearance of an edition of the *Alcestis* that undertakes to go to the bottom of things is to be heartily welcomed for the spirit alone, even if Dr. HAYLEY

were not so thoroughly equipped for his task as he has shown himself to be. The Introduction deals with The Myth of Alcestis, its History and Literary Treatment, and The Euripidean Play, The Critical Basis of the Text, and The Questions concerning the Scenic Representation of the Play, and is followed by an interesting essay by Dr. JAMES M. PATON on The Myth of Alcestis in Ancient Art. This work of a Harvard Doctor of Philosophy, fitly dedicated to the memory of two Harvard professors, Lane and Allen, is a Harvard document of prime significance.

The first edition of CHRIST'S *Geschichte der griechischen Literatur*, which forms a part of the great *Müller Handbuch* (Munich, Beck), appeared in 1889 and the third edition, much enlarged, bears date 1898. This rapid succession of editions is a marked tribute to the value of the work, which commended itself to me so much at the time of its first appearance that I made an abridgment of it by way of a preliminary study to a projected *Outline of Greek Literature*. Unfortunately, in boiling down the bulky work and transfusing Christ's German into my English, so much of my peculiar vein infiltrated the mass that the result seems to be unavailable for any serious purpose, and I mention my own experiment only to emphasize my conviction of the great serviceableness of Christ's book and my admiration of his diligence and grasp. A translation into English is doubtless one of the things to be expected, but a history of Greek literature that is meant for Germans, like a grammar of Greek that is meant for Germans, must be adapted, not translated merely. Otherwise it is only so much material, not the thing needed itself.

The new edition, the fourth, of the first volume of *Schoemann's Griechische Altertümer* (Weidmann) could not have been undertaken by a more competent scholar than Professor LIPSIVS. The work, one is happy to note, remains SCHOEMANN'S work, to which those who are old enough to remember the appearance of the first edition will always owe a special debt, and Professor LIPSIVS has made only those changes that are demanded by the advance of research in the domain of political antiquities. Six years, however, it seems, have passed since the printing began. In six years, as the editor himself recognizes, the remorseless progress of investigation is certain to bring about inconsistencies and repentances, but heavier draughts than this have been drawn on the indulgence of the learned public (A. J. P. XVI 262).

In the second part of LEAF and BAYFIELD'S *School Edition of the Iliad*, Bks. XIII-XXIV (Macmillan), there has been no change in the General Introduction nor in the Grammatical Introduction, which are simply repeated from the former part; and the same thing is to be said of the Appendices, even to such false accentuations as *κορύς* and *κυών*. One change, however, it is sad to note. The fear expressed in A. J. P. XVI 397 was only too well founded, and the omnipotent schoolboy has prevailed. The delightful Macmillan Greeks of the text have been abandoned for a large, clear but not especially attractive character. As in the companion volume, the seams of the *Iliad* have been traced everywhere, and all that we lack is the fashionable paintpot for the illumination of the coat of many colors, which, to be sure, like Joseph's coat, is not a coat of many colors. In a work honestly intended as an introduction to Homer, all this analysis would, in my judgment, be out of place, and in taking students through Homer for the first time, I should be tempted to assume the unitarian point of view, set forth in such detail by M. VICTOR TERRET, Professeur du petit séminaire d'Autun, in his elaborate work, *Homère* (Paris, Fontemoing). The sympathy with the student's fresh delight in Homer makes special pleading easy. But though LEAF and BAYFIELD'S book belongs to a series for colleges and schools, it is really meant for the same public as Leaf's larger edition. There is a curious disparateness between the grammatical trivialities and the recondite studies of the commentary, but that disparateness seems to be national.

BLASS, who had done so much for Bacchylides in the prenatal stage of Kenyon's edition, has rendered the Cean nightingale the further service of an edition of his own, which bears date March, 1898, since which time Bacchylidean literature has been accumulating at so rapid a rate that *Brief Mention* is dealing with an old story in recording the appearance of this valuable addition to the *Bibliotheca Teubneriana*. The introduction gives a description of the MS, a brief account of the poet's life, an estimate of his genius, and the main features of his dialect. The metres are treated at some length and the arguments of the several poems are given. Then follows the bibliography up to the date of publication, a *conspectus metrorum*, the text with critical notes, and an *Index vocabulorum*, which undertakes to be exhaustive. The variations from Kenyon's text and the attempts at restoration recorded by Blass furnish ample scope for comment, but it may be as well to wait until the Greek seminaries Cisatlantic and Transatlantic have wrought their will on the poet's remains. Still, I cannot help noting a welcome confirmation of my own judgment in one passage, VII 2, where Jebb reads *μηνός* and Kenyon refers *πεντήκοντα* to the number of the chorus, whereas

Blass gives *μήνες* and refers *πεντήκοντα* to the interval in months between the two Olympiads, as had seemed to me self-evident from the first. For Day as the daughter of Time and Night it is only necessary to cite Aischyl. Ag. 291 and Soph. Tr. 95. See my *Essays and Studies*, p. 438.

BLASS'S *Grammar of New Testament Greek* (Macmillan & Co.) has been translated into English by HENRY ST. J. THACKERAY. In the original German the book has already had a high place assigned to it in the Greek scholar's apparatus. From what has been said in this Journal about the same author's edition of the Acts (XVI 127), it will readily be understood that Blass's way of handling the problems of N. T. grammar is very congenial to those who, while yielding to none in their admiration, not to say adoration, of Attic, are yet broad-minded enough to take in the whole world of Greek and patient enough to trace the working of the organic laws of the language in the decay as well as in the culmination of Hellenic speech. In his *Lexicon Sophocles*, the Greek, apologizes by quoting Aristophanes: *συνεκποτέ' ἐστί σοι καὶ τὴν τρύγα*. Blass, the German, says, after Euripides: *τῶν καλῶν καὶ τὸ μετόπωρον καλόν*. It is a curious reversal of the usual points of view.

In noticing the appearance of Dr. RUTHERFORD'S *Scholia Aristophanica* (A. J. P. XVIII 244), I expressed my sympathy with him in a task which he found so uncongenial. But in looking more narrowly into the volumes I wonder more and more why he should have deemed it necessary to translate the scholia at all and thus increase his labors. Those who understand Greek enough to study Aristophanes critically will hardly need an interpreter for the simple scholia, and a man who had been so unfortunate in his encounter with *βαυβών* (Herondas, VI 19) and with *λαϊκάζειν*, which he translates, New Phrynichus 401, 'relieve oneself' (comp. Zacher, *Aristophanesstudien*, I 24), ought to have been content to dwell in decencies forever and leave Aristophanes' peculiar vocabulary alone. In any case, for an officially verecund headmaster of a great public school the problems must have been troublesome in the extreme. True, the proprieties are observed, but in a puzzling way. By apt transliteration's artful aid *τὸ αἰδοῖον* becomes *to aedoeon* and *πρωκτός* becomes *proctus*. But if *αἰδοῖον* becomes *aedoeon* and *πρωκτός* *proctus*, it seems to me that it would not have been amiss to render *ἀμῖς* by *amis* instead of the coarse English equivalent employed, for which Dr. RUTHERFORD might have used the more literary *jorden*, consecrated by Shakespeare. At the same time translations are

suggestive, and surely it is very instructive to find an eminent Greek grammarian translating (N. 1206) *παρ' ἀναλογίαν* 'by false analogy.' *ἀναλογία* means what we call 'accidence' and *παρ' ἀναλογίαν* signifies 'contrary to the regular inflexion,' which is not exactly the same as 'by false analogy,' and the second scholiast simply repeats in other words what the first had said: *περὶ τὴν κλητικὴν ἐσφάλῃ*, which Dr. RUTHERFORD renders 'Strepsiades makes a mistake in the vocative.' The mistake itself is attributed by the scholiast to 'rusticity.' Some commentators think it is due to the lyric swing of the passage. But analysis will not help. False inflexion is a very simple source of fun. *Στρεψιάδης* is as amusing in the mouth of Strepsiades as *Ἡρακλείδης* in the pages of a great champion of Euripides, or 'false analogy' in RUTHERFORD's translation.

Translations, except perhaps when they are exceptionally bad, withdraw themselves from the sphere of a periodical like the American Journal of Philology, and yet it is not fair that so unwearied a worker in the cause of classical philology as is Professor LAWTON should not have at least the meed of a passing notice under *Brief Mention*. In his *Successors of Homer* (Macmillan) Professor LAWTON has given us in fluent comment and translated extracts an outline of the less trodden ways of Greek hexametrical poetry, beginning with the Epic Cycle, traversing Hesiod and the Homeric Hymns, and concluding with the fragments of the philosophers who couched their doctrines in verse—Xenophanes, 'the true Homerid,' Parmenides, who 'sags in his poetic flight,' and Empedocles with his 'magnificent and sublime egotism.' The service rendered by such books to them that are without is unquestionable, and perhaps Professor LAWTON may reap the reward that he especially craves, and some of those who profess and call themselves Grecians may be incited by this attractive volume to study more carefully a range of Greek studies which he evidently considers too much neglected. Next to converting heathen, the missionary delights in stirring up the lazy brethren, foreseen of Hesiod, whose feet are too puffy to run and whose hands are too thin to work.

ERRATUM.—For 'Cicero's Orator,' XIX 232, l. 23 fr. top, 'Cicero de Oratore.'

CORRESPONDENCE.

Under the head of "Brief Mention" in the last number of the American Journal of Philology (vol. XIX, p. 231) is the following statement: "Professor Elmer belongs to a school of grammarians who attach scientific importance to their own translations, whereas to me translation is never a proof, only an illustration." In using these words, Professor Gildersleeve attributes to me principles so diametrically opposed to those which I really entertain and which I have uniformly followed as a guide in my syntactical investigations, that I am prompted to say a word in self-defence. I do not quite see how Professor Gildersleeve could use the words above quoted, if he did me the honor to read what I said on pages 153 ff. of my *Studies* regarding the utter worthlessness of translation in any attempt to determine the exact meaning of a foreign phrase. I there use the following language:

"In the first place it seems necessary to say—and upon this point I lay the greatest possible emphasis—that no one can hope to study the differences between the two tenses with any degree of success *without divorcing himself absolutely and completely from the idiom of his own language. It seems all the more necessary to lay the utmost emphasis upon the necessity of doing this*, because even some of the writers of our Latin grammars have apparently been influenced in their views by their feeling for the modern idiom. . . . *The manner in which expressions are handled in translations into a foreign language is not of the remotest consequence in determining the force of expressions in the original. Translations are, of course, frequently important for illustrative purposes, but they are absolutely worthless and often even wholly misleading in determining the exact force of original idioms. . . . Let us then at once divorce ourselves from every influence of our English idiom and study the differences from a purely Roman point of view.*"

It seems tolerably clear from these words that no one can attach less scientific importance than I do to my own translations, or to those of any one else. The one principle that I kept ever before me and followed implicitly in my *Studies in Latin Moods and Tenses* was that the real evidence regarding the Roman feeling for the various uses considered must be *internal* evidence. Nowhere do I attach any importance whatever to my translations, or even imply that I do, except for purposes of illustration after

showing from such internal evidence the Roman conception of the usage under consideration. For each view advocated, I have given reasons which seem to me ample. If any one can show that the reasons given are inadequate, that my premises are in any case inadmissible, or that my conclusions do not logically follow from my premises, I shall be very grateful to him for such correction. But I can hardly be expected to take kindly to being assigned to a class of investigators whose methods I have condemned in the strongest language I could command.

I am quite willing to subscribe to all that Professor Gildersleeve has said regarding the art of translation. I should, however, allow myself less latitude when translating for scientific purposes than I should when translating for literary purposes. A translation is at best a mere approximation; but, while recognizing this fact, we ought at the same time to recognize the other fact that some translations represent more accurately than others the point of view of those who used the original idiom. When one is translating solely for literary purposes, I should not object to his using 'must' (the 'moral must') as a translation of the so-called 'potential' subjunctive, on the ground of what I have called in my *Studies* its "equivalence of adaptability." I should be willing to go even further than that and, on the same grounds, allow him to translate *ne transieris* and *noli transire* by 'you must not cross'; *fac* and *facito*, by 'you must do'; as well as *non putaueris* and *credas* ('potential'), by 'you must not think' and 'you must believe.' But I should not expect these translations to give the student of Latin even so much as a hint of the differences between *ne* and *non*, or of those between the imperative and potential moods. I should expect them rather to give him the impression that no differences exist between the two negatives, or between the two moods; and, if I were particularly bent upon indicating to him the differences that actually do exist, I should be inclined to insist that *ne transieris* means 'do not cross'; *non putaueris*, 'you would not (for an instant) think'; *fac*, 'do'; and *credas*, 'one would suppose.' For scientific purposes, I should be inclined to insist upon these translations even at the risk of making an occasional artistic blunder—yes, even at the risk of being called a "mechanical uniformitarian," though I confess that this last might make me wince a little, if it came from a scholar whom I esteem so highly as I do Professor Gildersleeve.

In referring to the passage in Cic. Legg. 3, 1, 1 tu Platonem nec nimis ualde nec nimis saepe laudaueris, Professor Gildersleeve inadvertently cites the verb as *laudauerim*. If I had been able to find instances of *laudauerim* (i. e. of the first person, where the form is not identical with an indicative form), or similar instances of any other verb, in passages parallel to the one cited (and what I mean by 'parallel' will be clear to any one who reads my *Studies*), it would hardly have occurred to me to question the legitimacy of 'you can not praise, etc.,' as a trans-

lation of *nec . . . laudaueris*. More than that—if I had found such instances, much of what is now found in my *Studies* would never have been written.

CORNELL UNIVERSITY.

H. C. ELMER.

[Professor ELMER may have protested publicly and privately as clearly as I have done against attaching scientific importance to translation, and I grant that I ought to have perused with religious care every line of his *Studies in Latin Moods and Tenses*, but for all that I do not see how any one who reads his chapter on the supposed potential use of the subjunctive mood—and this is all that I had read—can fail to infer that he takes the various renderings seriously. After discussing “the *may* (possibility)-idea,” “the *can* (certainty)-idea,” “the *might* (possibility)-idea,” and the “*must*-idea,” he comes like Shelley’s Cloud, a fit prototype of much grammatical work, “with wings folded to rest on his airy nest,” “the *would* (first person, *should*)-idea.” These “would” and “should” translations he considers the only absolutely certain and indisputable renderings, and that despite the fact that “would” and “should” have as complicated a history and as elusive a practice as the “supposed potential.” Nay, it is a matter of notoriety that nine-tenths of American writers for the press are hazy and capricious when they are not absolutely incorrect in their use of ‘would’ and ‘should.’ Even those who keep their skirts fairly clean as to ‘shall’ and ‘will’ show themselves perfect draggletails on the adjacent domain. Now, if absolute certainty and indisputability are asserted of a translation and the translation itself is traced back to the “volitive,” I do not see why I am to be taken to task for failing to comment on the fact that Professor ELMER’S practice does not square with his theory. He has really come off better than he would have done, had I weighed every word of his elaborate treatise. But I am happy to rectify my mistake. My slip of the pen, inadvertence, blunder, whatever it may be called, in writing *laudaverim* for *laudaveris*—I had just written *velim*—would have appeared among the ERRATA, if Professor ELMER had not anticipated me.

B. L. G.]

RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

Thanks are due to Messrs. Lemcke & Buechner, 812 Broadway, New York, for material furnished.

AMERICAN.

Blass (F.) Grammar of New Testament Greek; tr. by H. St. J. Thackeray. New York, *The Macmillan Co.*, 1898. 9 + 340 pp. 8vo, cl., \$4.50.

Pausanias. Description of Greece; tr., with a commentary, by J. G. Frazer. New York, *The Macmillan Co.*, 1898. 6 v., il. 8vo, cl., per set, net \$30.

ENGLISH.

Butler (C.) The Lausiac History of Palladius. Text and Studies: Contributions of Biblical and Patristic Literature, edited by J. A. Robinson. London, 1898. 8vo. 7s. 6d.

Johns (J. H. W.) Assyrian Deeds and Documents, copied, collated, etc. Vol. I. Cuneiform Texts. London, 1898. 8vo. 21s.

King (L. W.) First Steps in Assyrian. London, 1898. 8vo. 542 pp. 15s.

Murray (J. A. H.) A New English Dictionary, on Historical Principles. Vol. V. Haversine-Heel. London, 1898. 4to, 68 pp. 2s. 6d.

St. Clair (G.) Creation Records Discovered in Egypt. London, 1898. 8vo, 504 pp. 10s. 6d.

Ummaga Jataka (The Story of the Tunnel). Translated from the Singalese by T. B. Yatawara. London, 1898. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

FRENCH.

Chauvin (Vct.) Bibliographie des ouvrages arabes ou relatifs aux Arabes, publiés dans l'Europe chrétienne de 1810 à 1885. III. Louqmâne et les fabulistes.—Barlaam.—'Antar et les romans de chevalerie. Liège, 1898. 8vo, 151 pp. m. 3.60.

Petit de Julleville (L.) Histoire de la langue et de la littérature française. Tome VI. Paris, 1898. 8vo. 16 fr.

Roussel (A.) Cosmologie hindoue d'après le Bhâgavata purâna. Paris, 1898. 12mo, 405 pp. 6 fr.

Terret (Vct.) Homère. Étude historique et critique. Paris, 1898. 8vo. III. 15 fr.

GERMAN.

Abhandlungen des archäologisch-epigraphischen Seminars der Universität Wien. Hrsg. v. O. Benndorf u. C. Bormann. XIII. Hft. gr. 8. Wien, A. Holder.—XIII. Brunšmid (Jos.) Die Inschriften u. Münzen der griechischen Städte Dalmatiens. ix, 86 S. m. Abbildgn. u. 7 Lichtdr.-Taf. m. 6.

Altenburg (Otto). De sermone pedestri Italogum vetustissimo. [Aus 'Jahrb. f. class. Philol.'] gr. 8. 54 S. L., *B. G. Teubner*. m. 2.

Anglia. Beiblatt: Mitteilungen aus dem gesamten Gebiete der engl. Sprache u. Litteratur. Hrsg. v. Max Frdr. Mann. 9. Bd. Mai 1898—April 1899. 12 Nrn. gr. 8. (Nr. 1, 32 S.) Halle, *M. Niemeyer*. m. 6.

— dasselbe. Jahrg. 1896–97. Suppl.-Hft. gr. 8. Ebd. m. 1.50.—

Petri (Alb.) Uebersicht ü. die im J. 1894 auf dem Gebiete der englischen Philologie erschienenen Bücher, Schriften u. Aufsätze. iii, 120 S.

Appel (Carl). Poésies provençales inédites, tirées des manuscrits d'Italie. gr. 8. 132 S. Paris, *H. Welter*. m. 4.

Aristidis (Aelii) Smyrnaei, quae supersunt omnia edidit Bruno Keil. Vol. II. Orationes XVII–LIII continens. gr. 8. xlii, 472 S. B., *Weidmann*. m. 20.

Babrii fabulae Aesopeae, recognovit Otto Crusius. Ed. minor. 8. 314 S. L., *B. G. Teubner*. m. 4.

Bibliothek der ältesten deutschen Litteratur-Denkmäler. III. Bd. Angelsächsische Denkmäler. 1. Tl. gr. 8. Paderborn, *F. Schöningh*.—III 1. Beowulf. Mit ausführl. Glossar hrsg. v. Mor. Heyne. 6. Aufl., bes. v. Adf. Socin. viii, 298 S. m. 5.

Billeter (Gust.) Geschichte des Zinsfusses im griechisch-römischen Altertum bis auf Justinian. gr. 8. xii, 381 S. L., *B. G. Teubner*. m. 12.

Caesaris (C. Julii) commentarii. Tertium ed. Eman. Hoffmann. Vol. II. Commentarii de bello civili. Accedunt commentarii de bello alexandrino, africano, hispaniensi. 12. 321 S. Wien, *C. Gerold's Sohn*. m. 1.60.

Carter (J. B.) De deorum romanorum cognominibus quaestiones selectae gr. 8. 64 S. L., *B. G. Teubner*. m. 2.

Cauer (Paul). Grammatica militans. Erfahrungen u. Wünsche im Gebiete des latein. u. griech. Unterrichts. gr. 8. vi, 168 S. B., *Weidmann*. Geb., m. 5.60.

Commentaria in Aristotelem graeca. Edita consilio et auctoritate academiae litterarum regiae borussicae. Vol. II, pars 3. gr. 8. B., *G. Reimer*.—II 3. Alexandri quod fertur in Aristotelis Sophisticos elenchos commentarium. Ed. Max. Wallies. xxxii, 238 S. m. 10.

Concordantiae Corani Arabicae. Dispos. Gust. Flügel. Ed. ster. Caroli Tauchnitz. 4. x, 219 S. L., *E. Bredt*. m. 15.

Corpus inscriptionum etruscarum, administrante Aug. Danielsson ed. Carol. Pauli. 8. segmentum. Fol. S. 475–554. L., *J. A. Barth*. m. 20.

Dessauer (Hugo). Die handschriftliche Grundlage der 19 grösseren pseudo-quintilianischen Declamationen. gr. 8. vii, 103 S. L., *B. G. Teubner*. m. 3.60.

Diels (H.) Ueber die Gedichte des Empedokles. [Aus 'Sitzungsber. d. k. preuss. Akad. d. Wiss.'] Lex. 8. 20 S. B., *G. Reimer in Komm.* m. 1.

Dippel (Rhard.) Quae ratio intercedat inter Xenophontis historiam graecam et Plutarchi vitas quaeritur. Diss. gr. 8. 116 S. Giessen, *C. Ricker*. m. 2.

Dissertationes philologicae Halenses. Vol. XIV. Pars I et II. gr. 8. Halle, *M. Niemeyer*.—I. Reinhold (Henr.) De graecitate patrum apostolicorum librorumque apocryphorum novi testamenti quaestiones grammaticae. 114 S. m. 2.80.—II. Schwandke (Geo.) De Aristophanis nubibus prioribus. 72 S. m. 1.60.

Dissertationes philologiae Vindobonenses. Vol. VI. gr. 8. iii, 190 S. Wien, *A. Hölder*. m. 4.80.

Dittl (Cajetan). Sprachlaute u. Lautschrift. Mit 1 Uebersichtstaf. 8. 14 S. Graz, *P. Cieslar*. m. —50.

Euripidis fabulae, edd. R. Prinz et N. Wecklein. Vol. I. Pars V–VII. gr. 8. L., *B. G. Teubner*.—V. Ion. Ed. N. Wecklein. v, 83 S. m. 2.80.—VI. Helena. Ed. N. Wecklein. v, 88 S. m. 3.—VII. Cyclops. Ed. N. Wecklein. v, 37 S. m. 1.40.

Fabricius (V.) De diis, fato Ioveque in P. Ovidii Nasonis operibus quae supersunt. gr. 8. 58 S. L., *Buchh. G. Fock*. m. 1.20.

Gemini elementa astronomiae. Recensuit, germanica interpretatione et commentariis instruxit Carol. Manitius. 8. xlv, 369 S. m. Fig. L., *B. G. Teubner*. m. 8.

Gerhard's v. Minden Fabeln in mittelniederdeutscher Sprache. Zum ersten Mal hrsg. v. Alb. Leitzmann. gr. 8. clxvi, 304 S. Halle, *M. Niemeyer*. m. 12.

Gregorii Barhebraei Ethicon, seu Moralia.—Liber columbae. Ed. (syriace) Paul. Bedjan, Cong. Miss. 8. ix, 18, 605 S. Parisiis. L., *O. Harrassowitz in Komm.* m. 22.50.

Gretser's (Jak.) de regno humanitatis comoedia prima. Hrsg. u. erläutert v. A. Dürrwächter. gr. 8. viii, 56 S. Regensburg, *A. Coppenrath's Verl.* m. 1.

Gröber (Gust.) Grundriss der romanischen Philologie. II. 3. Abtlg. 3. Lfg. gr. 8. S. 257–384. Strassburg, *K. J. Trübner*. m. 2.

Grueninger (Aug.) De Euripidis Oreste ab histrionibus retractata. Diss. gr. 8. 52 S. Basileae. Leipzig, *Buchh. G. Fock*. m. 1.50.

Handbuch der klassischen Altertums-Wissenschaft. Hrsg. von Iwan v. Müller. 8. Bd. 1. Abtlg. gr. 8. München, *C. H. Beck*.—VIII 1. Schanz (Mart.) Geschichte der römischen Litteratur bis zum Gesetzgebungswerk des Kaisers Justinian. 1. Tl.: Die röm. Litteratur in der Zeit der Republik. 2. Aufl. xviii, 421 S. m. 7.50; geb., m. 9.

Horovitz (Jos.) De Wâqidii liber qui Kitâb al Magâzi inscribitur. gr. 8. 48 S. B., *Mayer & Müller*. m. 1.50.

Jahresbericht, 5., des Instituts f. rumänische Sprache (rumänisches Seminar) zu Leipzig. Hrsg. v. Gust. Weigand. gr. 8. ix, 370 S. L., *J. A. Barth*. m. 6.

Jahresbericht üb. die Fortschritte der classischen Altertumswissenschaft, begründet v. Conr. Bursian. Mit den Beiblättern: Bibliotheca philologica classica u. Biographisches Jahrbuch f. Altertumskunde. General-Register zur 1. bis 3. Folge. (Jahrg. I–XXIII = Bd. 1–87.) Hrsg. v. Hugo Bloch. 6. u. 7. (Schluss-)Hft. gr. 8. iv u. S. 481–700. L., *O. R. Reisland*. Subskr.-Pr., m. 5.60; Kplt., m. 22.

Jahresberichte f. neuere deutsche Litteraturgeschichte, hrsg. v. J. Elias u. M. Osborn. 7. Bd. (J. 1896). 1. Abtlg. Lex. 8. 151 S. L., *G. J. Göschen*. m. 6.80.

Jurenka (Hugo). Die neugefundenen Lieder des Bakchylides. Text, Uebersetzg. u. Commentar. gr. 8. xv, 161 S. Wien, *A. Hölder*. m. 7.

Karolides (Paul). Die sogenannten Assyro-Chaldäer u. Hittiten v. Kleinasien. gr. 8. 175 S. Athen, *Barth & v. Hirst in Komm.* m. 3.

Keller (Hans). Das Kitâb Bağdād v. Abu'l Faḍl Aḥmad ibn Abi Ṭāhir Ṭāifūr. Folio 1–26. gr. 8. iv, 60 u. 27 S. Basel, *P. Kober in Komm.* m. 3.

Klement (Karl). Arion. Mythologische Untersuchg. Progr. gr. 8. 63 S. m. Fig. Wien, *A. Hölder*. m. 1.60.

Liebich (Bruno). Die Wortfamilien der lebenden hochdeutschen Sprache. 1. Tl. (In 6 Lfgn.) 1. Lfg. Lex. 8. S. 1-80. Breslau, *Preuss & Jünger*. m. 2.

Litzica (Const.) Das Meyersche Satzschlussgesetz in der byzantinischen Prosa, m. e. Anh. üb. Prokop v. Käsarea. Diss. gr. 8. 51 S. München, *A. Buchholz*. m. 1.

Ludwich (Arth.) Zwei byzantinische Odysseus-Legenden. Hrsg. v. L. Progr. gr. 4. 20 S. Königsberg, *Akadem. Buchh. v. Schubert & Seidel*. m. —30. Mayer-G'schrey (Ric.) Parthenius Nicaeensis. gr. 8. v, 69 S. Heidelberg, *C. Winter*. m. 2.

Michaelis (Walth.) De origine indicis deorum cognominum. Diss. gr. 8. 90 S. B., *Mayer & Müller*. m. 2.

Mitteilungen des Seminars f. orientalische Sprachen an der Friedrich Wilhelms-Universität zu Berlin. Hrsg. v. Ed. Sachau. 1. Jahrg. 3 Abthlgn. Lex. 8. B., *W. Spemann in Komm.* m. 15; Einzelpr. der Abtheilgn. à m. 6. —1. Ostasiatische Studien. Red. v. C. Arendt u. R. Lange. vi, iii, 210 S. —2. Westasiatische Studien. Red. v. A. Fischer u. K. Foy. iii, 332 S. —3. Afrikanische Studien. Red. v. C. Velten, G. Neuhaus, J. Lippert. iii, 205 S.

Mitteilungen der vorderasiatischen Gesellschaft. 3. Jahrg. 1898. 4. u. 5. Hft. gr. 8. B., *W. Peiser Verl. in Komm.* —4. Winckler (Hugo). II. Nachtrag zu M. V. A. G. 1898, I. 10 S. m. —60. —5. Messerschmidt (Leop.) Bemerkungen zu den hethitischen Inschriften. 48 S. m. 2 Abbildgn. m. 3.

Mueller (Mich.) In Senecae tragoedias quaestiones criticae. Diss. gr. 8. 58 S. B., *Mayer & Müller*. m. 1.50.

Müller (D. H.) Strophenbau u. Responsion. Neue Beiträge. gr. 8. 87 S. Wien, *A. Hölder*. m. 2.60.

Müller (Dav. Heinr.) Palmyrenische Inschriften nach Abklatschen. [Aus 'Denkschriften d. k. Akad. d. Wiss.'] gr. 4. 28 S. m. 3 Lichtdr.-Taf. Wien, *C. Gerold's Sohn in Komm.* m. 3.20.

Muss-Arnolt (W.) A Concise Dictionary of the Assyrian Language. Part 7. gr. 8. S. 385-448. B., *Reuther & Reichard*. m. 5.

Passowicz (Petr.) De Flori codice Cracoviensi. [Aus 'Sitzungsber. d. Akad. d. Wiss. zu Krakau.'] Krakau, *Buchh. der poln. Verlags-Gesellschaft in Komm.* m. —50.

Pautz (Otto). Muhammeds Lehre v. der Offenbarung, quellenmässig untersucht. gr. 8. vii, 304 S. L., *J. C. Hinrichs' Verl.* m. 8.

Pittier de Fábrega (H.) Die Sprache der Bribri-Indianer in Costa Rica. [Aus 'Sitzungsber. d. k. Akad. d. Wiss.'] gr. 8. 149 S. m. 1 Karte. Wien, *C. Gerold's Sohn in Komm.* m. 3.60.

Pleyte (W.) et Boeser (P. A. A.) Manuscrits coptes du musée d'antiquités des Pays-Bas à Leide. gr. 4. vi, 490 S. m. 2 Lichtdr.-Taf. Leiden, *E. J. Brill*. Kart., m. 42.50.

Plutarch's ausgewählte Biographien. Erklärt v. Otto Siefert u. Frdr. Blass. 4. Bdchn. Aristides u. Cato v. Frdr. Blass. 2. Aufl. gr. 8. 116 S. L., *B. G. Teubner*. m. 1.20.

Pohlenz (Max). De Posidonii libris περὶ παθῶν. [Aus 'Jahrb. f. class. Philol.'] gr. 8. 100 S. L., *B. G. Teubner*. m. 3.60.

Polanski (Pet.) Die Labialisierung u. Palatalisierung im Neuslavischen. gr. 8. viii, 81 S. B., *S. Calvary & Co.* m. 3.

Popowicz (Emilian). Ruthenisches Sprachbuch. 1. Thl. gr. 8. iv, 168 S. Czernowitz, *H. Pardini.* Kart., m. 2.

Ptolemaei (Claudii) opera quae exstant omnia. Vol. I. Syntaxis mathematica. Ed. J. L. Heiberg. Pars I, libros I–VI continens. vi, 546 S. m. Fig. u. 1 Taf. L., *B. G. Teubner.* m. 8.

Rheden (P.) Etymologische Beiträge zum italienischen Wörterbuch. Progr. gr. 8. 39 S. Brixen, *Selbstverl.* m. —75.

Rössner (Otto). Untersuchungen zu Heinrich v. Morungen. gr. 8. viii, 96 S. B., *Weidmann.* m. 2.40.

Rück (Karl). Die Naturalis Historia des Plinius im Mittelalter. [Aus 'Sitzungsber. d. k. b. Akad. d. Wiss.'] gr. 8. iii, 118 S. München, *G. Franz' Verl. in Komm.* m. 2.

Sakellarios (Anast.) Untersuchung des Textes der 'Αθηναίων πολιτεία des Aristoteles. gr. 8. iv, 37 S. Jena, *H. Haerdle.* m. 1.

Sammlung kurzer Grammatiken germanischer Dialekte. Hrsg. v. Wilh. Braune. III. gr. 8. Halle, *M. Niemeyer.*—III. Sievers (Ed.) Angelsächsische Grammatik. 3. Aufl. xiii, 318 S. m. 6.

Sbiera (R. I.) Die prosodischen Functionen inlautender muta cum liquida bei Vergil. gr. 8. 60 S. Czernowitz, *H. Pardini.* m. 2.

Scala (Rud. v.) Die Staatsverträge des Altertums. 1. Tl. gr. 8. xv, 226 S. L., *B. G. Teubner.* m. 8.

Schenkl (Heinr.) Zur Kritik u. Ueberlieferungsgeschichte des Grattius u. anderer lateinischer Dichter. [Aus 'Jahrb. f. klass. Philol.'] gr. 8. 98 S. L., *B. G. Teubner.* m. 3.60.

Schmid (Geo.) De aquila, ἀγνπιῶ, ἀρη. [Aus 'Commentaria ministerii instr. publ.'] gr. 8. 29 S. St. Petersburg, *K. L. Ricker in Komm.* m. 1.

Statius, P. Papinius. Vol. III. Lactanti Placidi commentarios in Statii Thebaida et commentarium in Achilleida rec. Ricard. Jahnke. 8. xii, 522 S. L., *B. G. Teubner.* m. 8.

Stumme (Hans). Märchen u. Gedichte aus der Stadt Tripolis in Nordafrika. 2 Tle. in 1 Bd. Lex. 8. x, 317 S. L., *J. C. Hinrichs' Verl.* m. 16.

Thiele (Geo.) Antike Himmelsbilder. Mit 7 Taf. u. 72 in den Text gedr. Abbildgn. gr. 4. viii, 184 S. B., *Weidmann.* Kart., m. 20.

Thieme u. Preusser. Wörterbuch der englischen u. deutschen Sprache. Jubiläums-Ausg. bearb. v. Ig. Eman. Wessely. 2 Tle. in 1 Bde. gr. 8. xii, 455 u. 442 S. Hamburg, *Haendcke & Lehmkuhl.* Geb. in Halbfrz., m. 7.20.

Tiktin (H.) Rumänisch-deutsches Wörterbuch. 4. Lfg. Lex. 8. S. 193–256. Bukarest. Leipzig, *O. Harrassowitz.* m. 1.60.

Wechsler (Ed.) Die Sage vom heiligen Gral in ihrer Entwicklung bis auf Richard Wagners Parsifal. 8. x, 212 S. mit 1 Tab. Halle, *M. Niemeyer,* 1898. m. 3.

Weigand (Gust.) Linguistischer Atlas des dacorumänischen Sprachgebietes. 1 : 600,000. In 8–10 Lfgn. 1. Lfg. 8 Blatt à 52.5×49 cm. Lith. u. kolor. L., *J. A. Barth.* m. 4.

Welzhofer (Karl). Die ars poetica des Horaz. gr. 8. iii, 64 S. Straubing, *C. Attenkofer.* m. 1.

Wiese (Berthold) u. Pèrcopo (Erasmus). Geschichte der italienischen Litteratur von den ältesten Zeiten bis zur Gegenwart. (In 14 Lfgn.) 1. Lfg. gr. 8. S. 1-48 m. 3 (1 farb.) Taf. u. 1 Fksm. L., *Bibliograph. Institut.* m. 1.

Winckler (Hugo). Altorientalische Forschungen. 2. Reihe. I. Bd. 3. Hft. (IX der ganzen Folge.) gr. 8. L., *E. Pfeiffer.*—3. Die reiche v. Cilicien u. Phrygien im lichte der altorientalischen inschriften.—Aeschylus Persae 751-769. S. 103-142. m. 2.30.

Xenophontis de re publica Atheniensium libellus. Rec. Ernest. Kalinka. Ed. minor. gr. 8. 51 S. Wien, *A. Hölder.* m. 1.10.

ITALIAN.

Perez (F.) Scritti. Vol. I. Studi danteschi. 16mo, p. 556.—Vol. II. La Beatrice svelata. 16mo, p. 434.—Vol. III. Scritti rari. Storia, arte, letteratura, politica. Palermo. 16mo, p. 622. L. 18.

Rossi (Salvatore). Il mito di Amphiaraios nella letteratura e nell' arte figurata. Parte I. Firenze. 8vo, p. 99. L. 2.50.

Stampini (E.) Il codice torinese di Lucano del secolo XII. Torino. 8vo, p. 16. L. 1.20.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

Aelii Aristidis Smyrnaei quae supersunt omnia. Ed. Bruno Keil. Volumen II. Orr. XVII-LIII continens. Berolini, *Ap. Weidmannos*, MDCCCXCVIII. 20 m.

Aeschylus. Prometheus Vincit. With introd. and notes by E. E. Sikes and St. J. B. Wynne Willson. London and New York, *Macmillan*, 1898.

Bain (C. W.) First Latin Book. New York, *University Publishing Co.*, 1898.

Bates (Fred. Orlando). The Five Post-Kleisthenean Tribes. (Cornell Studies in Classical Philology, No. VIII.) New York, *The Macmillan Co.*, 1898.

Blass (Friedrich). Grammar of New Testament Greek. Translated by H. St. J. Thackeray. London and New York, *Macmillan*, 1898. \$4.50.

Bray (J. W.) A History of English Critical Terms. Boston, *D. C. Heath & Co.*, 1898.

Bulletin du XII^{me} Congrès International des Orientalistes.

Christ (Wilhelm). Geschichte der griechischen Literatur bis auf die Zeit Justinians. 3. vermehrte u. verbesserte Aufl. (Iwan v. Müller's Handbuch der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft, 7. Band.) München, *C. H. Beck*, 1898. 16 m. 50 pf.

Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum. Ed. consilio et impensis Academiae Litterarum Caesariae Vindobonensis. Vol. XXVII: L. Caeli Firmiani Lactanti opera omnia. Partis II. Fasc. 2. Recenss. S. Brandt et Georgius Laubmann. Indices confecit Samuel Brandt. 1897.

— Vol. XXXVIII: S. Filastri Diversarum Hereseon Liber ex rec. Frideric Marx. Vindobonae, *F. Tempsky*, 1898.

Educational Review. Ed. by N. M. Butler. Sept., Oct., Nov. 1898. New York, *Henry Holt & Co.* \$3 per annum.

English Dictionary (The Oxford). Ed. by J. A. H. Murray. Gaincope-Germanizing. Vol. IV. By Henry Bradley. Oxford, *At the Clarendon Press*. New York, *Henry Frowde*, 1898. \$1.25.

Euripides. Alceste, ed. with an introd. and critical and exegetical notes, by H. W. Hayley. Boston, *Ginn & Co.*, 1898.

Fabricius (V.) De diis fato Ioveque in P. Ovidii Nasonis operibus quae supersunt. Lipsiae, *Fock*, 1898. 1 m. 20 pf.

Gerth (B.) Griechische Schulgrammatik. 5. Aufl. Leipzig, *G. Freytag*, 1898. Geb., 2 m. 40 pf.

Green (E. L.) School History of Florida. Baltimore, *Williams & Wilkins Co.*, 1898.

Gudeman (Alfred). Latin Literature of the Empire. Selected and edited, with revised texts and with brief introduction. Vol. I. Prose: Velleius—Boethius. New York, *Harper & Brothers*, 1898.

Harre (P.) u. Giercke (M.) Lateinisches Uebungsbuch. Erster Teil: Sexta. Leipzig, *G. Freytag*, 2 m.

Horace. Odes and Epodes. Ed. with introd. and notes by Paul Shorey. Boston, *Benj. H. Sanborn* (1898).

Hübner (Emil). Die Büste von Ilici. Sonder-Abdruck aus dem Jahrbuch des Kaiserl. Deutschen Archaeologischen Instituts. Bd. XIII. 1898. 3. Heft.

Jastrow (Morris). The Religion of Babylonia and Assyria. (Handbooks on the History of Religions.) Boston, *Ginn & Co.*, 1898.

Jebb (R. C.) In Memory of Giacomo Leopardi. A Greek version of his Ode on the Monument of Dante at Florence.

Jurenka (Hugo). Schulwörterbuch zu Ovids Metamorphosen. Mit 82 in d. Text gedruckten Abbildungen. Leipzig, *G. Freytag*, 1898. 3 m. 40 pf.

Kalkmann (A.) Die Quellen der Kunstgeschichte des Plinius. Berlin, *Weidmann*, 1898. 9 m.

Koch (A.) Schülerkommentar zu Homers Odyssee. Leipzig, *G. Freytag*, 1898. 1 m.

Lane (Geo. M.) A Latin Grammar for Schools and Colleges. New York and London, *Harper & Brothers*, 1898.

Lawton (W. C.) The Successors of Homer. New York, *The Macmillan Co.*, 1898. \$1.50.

Lysias. Ten Selected Orations. Ed. with introd., notes and appendices by W. H. Wait. New York, *American Book Co.*, 1898.

Monumentum Ancyranum. Ed. by William Fairley. Department of History, U. of Penna. Philadelphia, 1898.

Muret-Sanders' Encyclopädisches Wörterbuch der englischen u. deutschen Sprache. Teil II: Deutsch-Englisch. Lfg. 6: Deist-Eindruck. Lfg. 7: Eindruck-Ernährung. Lfg. 8: Ernann-Fort. New York, *International News Co.*

Musa Claudia. Translations into Latin elegiac verse by S. G. Owen and J. S. Phillimore. Oxford, *At the Clarendon Press*.

Neue Jahrbücher für das klassische Altertum, Geschichte u. deutsche Literatur u. für Pädagogik. Herausg. v. J. Ilberg u. Richard Richter. Erster Jahrg. Leipzig, *Teubner*, 1898.

Nilsson (Victor). Loddfáfnismál. An Eddic Study. (Doctoral Diss.) Minneapolis, *University Press*, 1898.

Nohl (Hermann). Schülerkommentar zu Ciceros IV. Buche gegen C. Verres. Leipzig, *G. Freytag*, 1898. Geb., 70 pf.

— Schülerkommentar zu Ciceros Reden gegen Q. Caecilius u. für d. Dichter Archias. Leipzig, *G. Freytag*, 1898. 30 pf.

Passio Andreae, Ex actis Andreae, Martyris Andreae, Acta Andreae et Matthiae, Acta Petri et Andreae, Passio Bartholomaei, Acta Ioannis, Martyrium Matthiae. Ed. Max. Bonnet. Lipsiae, *Hermann Mendelssohn*, 1898.

Πρακτικά τῆς ἐν Ἀθῆναις ἀρχαιολογικῆς ἐταιρείας τοῦ ἔτους 1897. Ἀθήνησιν, 1898.
Revue des humanités en Belgique. Publication trimestrielle. Hasselt. 5 fr. par an.

Sanders (Henry A.) Die Quellencontamination im 21. u. 22. Buche des Livius. Berlin, *Mayer u. Müller*, 1898.

Sandys (J.-E.) Une statue de Demosthène. Mélanges Weil. Extrait. Paris, *Albert Fontemoing*, 1898.

Schanz (Martin). Geschichte der römischen Litteratur bis zum Gesetzgebungswerk des Kaisers Justinian. Erster Teil: Die römische Litteratur in der Zeit der Republik. 2. Aufl. Handbuch der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft. Achter Band. 1. Abteilung. München, *C. H. Beck*, 1898. 7 m. 50.

Searles (Helen M.) A Lexicographical Study of the Greek Inscriptions. (University of Chicago Studies in Classical Philology.) Chicago, *University of Chicago Press*, 1898.

Shelley, Select Poems of. Ed. with introd. and notes by W. J. Alexander. Boston, *Ginn & Co.*, 1898.

Smith (C. Alphonso). An Old English Grammar and Exercise Book. New ed., revised and enlarged. Boston, *Allyn & Bacon*, 1898.

Stengel (Paul). Die griechischen Kunstaltertümer. 2. vermehrte u. verb. Auflage. (Iwan v. Müller's Handbuch der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft, Fünfter Bd., 3. Abtlg.) München, *C. H. Beck*. 5 m.

Studniczka (Franz). Die Siegesgöttin. Entwurf der Geschichte einer antiken Idealgestalt. (Sonderabdruck aus den Jahrbüchern f. d. classische Altertum u. s. w.) Leipzig, *Teubner*, 1898. 2 m.

Sweet (Henry). A New English Grammar, Logical and Historical. Part II: Syntax. Oxford, *At the Clarendon Press*. New York, *Henry Frowde*, 1898. 3s. 6d.

Synopsis evangelica, concinnavit, illustravit, recensuit Constantinus de Tischendorf. Ed. septima. Lipsiae, *Hermann Mendelssohn*, 1898.

Tacitus. Dialogus de oratoribus. With introduction and notes by Alfred Gudeman. Smaller edition. Boston, *Allyn & Bacon*, 1898.

Terret (Victor). Homère. Étude historique et critique. Paris, *Fontemoing*, 1899. 15 fr.

Thiele (Georg). Antike Himmelsbilder. Mit 7 Tafeln u. 72 in den Text gedruckten Abbildungen. Berlin, *Weidmann*, 1898. 20 m.

Traité de tactique (περί καταστάσεως ἀπλήκτου). Texte grec inédit établi par Charles Graux, préparé par Albert Martin. (Notices et Extraits, vol. XXXVI.) Paris, *Klincksieck*, 1898. 2 fr. 60 c.

Tropea (Giacomo). Ecateo da Mileto ed i frammenti della ΠΕΡΙΠΤΗΣΙΣ. Messina, 1897.

— Giasone, il tago della Tessaglia. Messina, 1898.

— Manuale di fonti letterarie della storia greca e romana. Erodoto (saggio). Messina, 1898.

Tümpel (H.) Niederdeutsche Studien. Leipzig, *Velhagen u. Klasing*, 1898. 3 m.

Uhlenbeck (C. C.) Kurzgefasstes etymologisches Wörterbuch der altindischen Sprache. Erster Band: a-—pdç-. Amsterdam, *Johannes Müller*, 1898.

U. S. Civil Service Commission. Fourteenth Report. July 1, 1896, to June 30, 1897. Washington, *Government Printing Office*, 1898.

Vocabularium Iurisprudentiae Romanae editum iussu Instituti Savigniani. Vol. I. Fasc. II. ACCIPIO—MITTO. Berlin, *Georg Reimer*, 1898. 8 m.

Vox Urbis. Ann. 1. Num. 1. (Bis in mense prodit.) Romae, *Forzani*, MDCCCXCVIII. 15 l. per ann.

Weil (H.) Observations sur un texte poétique et un document judiciaire conservés sur papyrus. (Revue des études grecques.) 1898.